



No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

—CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION—

For State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/esea/pdf/wiplan.pdf>

June 2002

This application, including revisions made subsequent to its original submission date of June 10, 2002, was approved by the USDE on July 2, 2002. The revised text is in blue.

Elizabeth Burmaster
State Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
Madison, Wisconsin



June 2002

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, creed, pregnancy, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, or physical, mental, emotional or learning disability.

Table of Contents

Consolidated State Application Signature Page.....	v
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet.....	vii
ESEA Programs Included in the Consolidated Application—Checklist.....	ix
SEA Contacts for ESEA Programs	xi
Consolidated State Application Contents:	
Introduction.....	1
Part I: ESEA Goals and Indicators	5
Part II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs	9
Part III: ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information.....	73
GEPA Requirements.....	108
Assurances and Certifications:	
General and Cross-Cutting Assurances.....	113
Certification.....	114
ESEA Program Specific Assurances.....	114
Appendixes:	
Appendix A—Intent to Apply—Competitive Grants Under Title VI, Subpart I, Section 6112.....	A-1
Appendix B—Needs Assessment Measure used by the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program	A-9
Appendix C—Required 15 Program Elements of Even Start Family Literacy Programs.....	A-13
Appendix D—List of Acronyms.....	A-17

Consolidated State Application—Signature Page

The State of Wisconsin hereby requests funds as authorized by section 9302 of the ESEA for the programs selected and identified on the “List of Programs Included in this Consolidated Application.”

1. Legal name of Applicant Agency (State Educational Agency): Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction	2. D.U.N.S. number: 809611254 Taxpayer ID Number (TIN): 39-6006487W
3. Address (include zip): 125 South Webster Street P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841	4. Contact Person for Consolidated Application Name: Elizabeth Burmaster Position: State Superintendent Telephone: 608-266-8687 Fax: 608-267-1052 E-Mail: elizabeth.burmaster@dpi.state.wi.us
5. Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? <u>X</u> No <div style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes, explanation attached.</div>	
6. By signing this consolidated state application, the state certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the programs included in this Consolidated State Application have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the state): i. Section 14303 and EDGAR. The assurances in Section 9304 (a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) ii. ESEA Program Assurances. Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing any program included in this Application. iii. Assurances and Certifications. Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under “Assurances and Certifications.” iv. Crosscutting. As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs). v. Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace. The three certifications in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96).) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts have changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.	
7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certifications provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.	
a. Printed Name and Title of Authorized State/SEA Representative: Elizabeth Burmaster, State Superintendent	b. Telephone: 608-266-8687 Fax: 608-267-1052 E-Mail: elizabeth.burmaster@dpi.state.wi.us
c. Signature of Authorized State/SEA Representative:	d. Date:

Safe Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants

Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet

1. Legal Name of Applicant Agency (Chief Executive Office): Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services	2. DUNS Number: 081124096
3. Address (including zip code): 1 West Wilson Street, Room 650 Madison, WI 53702	4. Contact Person Name: Phyllis Dubé Position: Secretary Telephone: 608-266-9622 Fax: 608-266-7882 E-Mail Address: dubepj@dhfs.state.wi.us
5. Reservation of Funds: 20% Indicate the amount the Governor wishes to reserve (up to 20%) of the total state SDFSCA State Grant allocation.	
6. By signing this form the Governor certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the state): i. Section 14303 and EDGAR. The assurances in Section 9304(a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). ii. ESEA Program Assurances. Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program. iii. Assurances and Certification. Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under “Assurances and Certifications.” iv. Cross-Cutting. As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs). v. Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace. The three certification in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96).) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts has changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.	
7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certification provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.	
8. Typed name of Chief Executive Officer Governor Scott McCallum	9. Telephone Number:
10. Signature of Chief Executive Officer	11. Date

ESEA Programs Included in the Consolidated State Application CHECKLIST

The State of Wisconsin requests funds for the programs indicated below:

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

Title I, Part B, Subpart 3: Even Start Family Literacy

Title I, Part C: Education of Migrant Children

Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform

Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology

Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2: Community Service Grants

Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Title V, Part A: Innovative Programs

Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111: State Assessment Program

Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program

Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income Schools

Appendix A—Intent to Apply—Competitive Grants Under Title VI, Subpart I, Section 6112

SEA Contacts for ESEA Programs

ESEA Program Title	SEA Program Contact		
	Name	Phone	E-Mail address
Title I, Part A	Myrna Toney	608-266-2690	myrna.toney@dpi.state.wi.us
Title I, Part B, 3	Monica Notaro	608-267-9141	monica.notaro@dpi.state.wi.us
Title I, Part C	Myrna Toney	608-266-2690	myrna.toney@dpi.state.wi.us
Title I, Part D	Myrna Toney	608-266-2690	myrna.toney@dpi.state.wi.us
Title I, Part F	Bette Achtor	608-267-9106	bettejane.achtor@dpi.state.wi.us
Title II, Part A	(Teacher Quality) Abdallah Bendada	608-267-9270	abdallah.bendada@dpi.state.wi.us
	(PI-34) Kathryn Lind	608-266-1788	kathryn.lind@dpi.state.wi.us
	(SAGE/Class Size Reduction) Janice Zmrazek	608-266-2489	janice.zmrazek@dpi.state.wi.us
Title II, Part D	Rob Roy	608-261-6332	robert.roy@dpi.state.wi.us
Title III, Part A	Seree Weroha	608-266-7292	seree.weroha@dpi.state.wi.us
Title IV, Part A (SEA)	Steve Fernan	608-266-3889	steven.fernan@dpi.state.wi.us
Title IV, Part A (Governor)	Steve Fernan (WDPI)	608-266-3889	steven.fernan@dpi.state.wi.us
	Lou Oppor (WDHFS)	608-266-9485	OPPORLL@dhfs.state.wi.us
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2	Steve Fernan	608-266-3889	steven.fernan@dpi.state.wi.us
Title IV, Part B	Steve Fernan	608-266-3889	steven.fernan@dpi.state.wi.us
Title V, Part A	Bette Achtor	608-267-9106	bettejane.achtor@dpi.state.wi.us
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6111	Maggie Burke	608-267-3164	maggie.burke@dpi.state.wi.us
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6112	Maggie Burke	608-267-3164	maggie.burke@dpi.state.wi.us
Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2	Diana Kasbaum	608/267-7338	diana.kasbaum@dpi.state.wi.us

Introduction

The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) revised, reauthorized, and consolidated various programs within the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and extended authorizations of appropriations for ESEA programs through FY 2007. The NCLB builds on prior ESEA legislation of academic content and student achievement standards, assessments, and accountability, with additional provisions for ensuring all children are provided opportunities to succeed. The central features of NCLB, including high academic standards and accountability, highly qualified teachers, parental involvement, and safe and orderly schools for all children are consistent with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's (WDPI) efforts to improve education in Wisconsin. NCLB provides a tremendous opportunity for a strong partnership among local, state, and federal government. The WDPI plans on employing ESEA to build on existing state initiatives that will ensure reaching its performance goals established within the state plan.

Due to the number of acronyms used throughout this document, an acronym list has been developed and can be found in Appendix D.

The New Wisconsin Promise

State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster took office on July 1, 2001, and has articulated a "New Wisconsin Promise" (NWP) of leadership, advocacy, and accountability for public schools and libraries. Fundamental to the NWP is closing the achievement gap among children of color, economically disadvantaged students, and their peers. The key strategic priorities of the NWP, organized under the concepts of leadership, advocacy, and accountability, are consistent with NCLB. The state superintendent established a NWP task force to align intradepartmental responsibilities with the NCLB. The key strategic priorities include:

- **Reading** is the fundamental skill that separates those who succeed from those who struggle. Upon assuming office, the state superintendent created a Division for Reading and Student Achievement to coordinate assessment, Title I, early childhood education, and family-school-community partnerships. The WDPI takes pride in many initiatives promoting literacy including:
 - VISTA and AmeriCorps projects focusing on literacy and family-school-community partnerships.
 - Even Start Family Literacy (ESFL) projects throughout the state.
 - A model third-grade reading assessment requiring educators to respond to the needs of the children not meeting proficiency levels.
 - A nationally-recognized curriculum planning guide in reading.
- **Early learning opportunities** are essential to closing the achievement gap and guaranteeing that all children succeed. Wisconsin is one of the few states that provides state funding for four-year-old kindergarten. A growing number of school districts are collaborating in their communities to establish four-year-old kindergarten programs. Wisconsin established the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea/sage/index.html>) which provides state funding to school districts to:
 - Limit class size in kindergarten through third grade to 15 students per teacher.
 - Develop a rigorous curriculum.

- Provide professional staff development to coincide with high standards.
- Build strong family-school-community partnerships.
- **Educator quality** is a top priority in Wisconsin as it is nationally. Wisconsin's new statewide professional development standards emphasize continuing professional development opportunities for all staff and place a priority on providing mentors to help teachers succeed. Wisconsin's new administrative rule, Chapter PI 34 (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>), holds the promise of uniting policy, theory and practice to ensure quality professional teachers and administrators for the state's public and private schools.
- **Family-school-community partnerships** play an integral role in school improvement. Parents and schools must work together as advocates and teachers for all children. The state superintendent appointed a Parent Leadership Corps to promote best practice on how Wisconsin schools can expand and engage families and communities to improve learning for all children. The Wisconsin's Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) provides an Internet-based school improvement resource for school staff, families, and other community members. The WDPI also promotes youth service-learning, which connects what children learn in the classroom to real needs in the community. This past year, the WDPI received the state leadership award from the National Network of Partnership Schools at Johns Hopkins University.
- **Career and technical education** better prepares students for all post-high school opportunities. Whether moving on to further education, training, or employment, every Wisconsin student moves through curriculum-based career awareness, exploration, planning, and preparation leading to a realistic individualized career plan which is compatible with the student's abilities, aptitudes, and interests.

School communities that are safe and inclusive of all children provide the foundation through which these strategic priorities operate. This NWP will enable our state to break down the greatest barriers to education, renew the commitment to accountability in student achievement, and provide quality assistance to educators, parents and communities in ways that ensure success for all children.

The NWP will be the framework through which state and federal education initiatives will be integrated. Examples of that framework in action include redefining teacher education and licensing, developing WINSS, and continuing to build on the strong family-school-community partnerships that acknowledge that parents are the first and most important teachers of their children.

Teacher Education and Licensing

Wisconsin has redefined teacher, administrator, and pupil service staff qualification standards and is implementing a standards-based, performance-driven system of teacher preparation and licensing.

Chapter PI 34 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code (found at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>) outlines how the state will guarantee the availability of highly qualified professional teachers in the future. The state has changed its teacher education program approval approach to a performance-based method. All teachers fully licensed by the state will be highly qualified. The state has selected the Educational Testing Service as the vendor for teacher tests that will be given in content areas beginning in 2004.

The state has designed and is piloting a model professional development plan that is linked to new state standards for teachers and administrators. These state efforts, along with fiscal support under ESEA, will ensure all students are taught by highly qualified teachers.

Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS)

The WINSS, an Internet-based school improvement resource, outlines standards of accountability in the following three areas:

1. Student achievement based on the model academic standards across 18 content areas.
2. School system efficacy based on seven Characteristics of Successful Schools (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/sit/cssovrvw1.html>).
3. Staff effectiveness as defined by educator proficiency standards in Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin Administrative Code (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>).

The WINSS website (<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html>) is an excellent tool to help not only schools identified for improvement, but any school wishing to improve performance in one or more of the accountability arenas. (A brochure regarding WINSS can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/pdf/brochure.pdf>).

WINSS has four sections:

1. *Standards and Assessment* describes the Wisconsin model academic content standards and state and local assessment tools available to educators to evaluate student progress in attaining proficiency in the required subject areas. The first section also describes state efforts to encourage schools to establish high standards for student behavior and conduct as well as strategies to assess related effectiveness in that area.
2. *Data Analysis* makes all data the WDPI collects from schools about students available in a disaggregated format. Student data include demographics, performance on state test assessments, course-taking patterns, attendance, retention, drug and violence incidents, suspensions, expulsions, participation rates in community service, and extra- and co-curricular participation. Information is displayed at the building level whenever possible. Other data available in this section include staffing ratios, course offerings, as well as state, federal, and local funding levels.
3. *Continuous School Improvement* describes Wisconsin-developed Characteristics of Successful Schools (CSS). This section describes the research base supporting the characteristics, and provides eight self-assessment surveys that staff and community members can use to evaluate how well their school is meeting the standards. The Characteristics of Successful Schools publication can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/sit/cssovrvw1.html>

Under development is a school improvement planning tool that will walk school staff through analysis of student performance data, the development of improvement goals, and the selection of research-based improvement strategies. The result will be a school improvement plan. As schools implement their plan, they will be able to enter progress reports. Schools identified for improvement will use variations of this plan based on the requirements in the NCLB. Schools identified for improvement will put their plans on the WDPI server, allowing state consultants to track implementation progress as it happens. The CSS surveys and the school improvement planning tool are being developed with the assistance and funding from the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).

4. *Best Practices* contains resources for school staff to use in designing improvements based on the CSS. This section will also contain a resource library of best practices linked to the school improvement planning tool. Users can search the resource library according to improvement goals

and receive a list of best practices to consider in meeting the local goals. For example, teachers can use an interactive curriculum wizard to write or revise teaching units. The Best Practices section contains:

- The course of study/unit.
- Thematic planning.
- Identification of content and performance standards.
- Guiding questions.
- Student assessment strategies.
- Instructional techniques.
- Resources
- Learning activities.
- Teacher reflection about unit efficacy.

The NWP demonstrates WDPI has made great strides in articulating standards of excellence for students, staff, and school systems. This articulation puts Wisconsin in an excellent position to implement ESEA and reach each of the six ESEA performance goals. The NWP provides the foundation for Wisconsin's ESEA state plan.

We look forward to the opportunities and challenges that lie ahead and have begun the thoughtful dialogue necessary to implement this act. Our consolidated application represents a cross-agency effort to not only comply with the requirements of the application but to move to truly integrate the various funding opportunities and provisions for maximum benefit at the local level for students.

Part I: ESEA Goals, ESEA Indicators, State Performance Targets

Accountability, especially as it is reflected in student achievement results, drives the consolidated application's contents. The following ESEA performance goals and indicators cut across the ESEA programs included in the application and reflect the key No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 goal of improved achievement for all students.

Instructions:

*In the **June 2002 submission***, write a statement indicating that the state has adopted the five goals, the corresponding indicators and has agreed to submit targets and baseline data related to the goals and indicators identified in the application. States may submit any additional state goals and indicators that the state has identified as overall goals for improving student achievement.

*In the **May 2003 submission***, provide performance targets for each indicator and baseline data for the targets, unless previously submitted.

(In organizing this portion of your application, please use the same headings and numbering that we have provided so that reviewers can quickly and accurately locate your response to each item.)

Note: The SEA will be asked to provide data in the annual performance report to indicate progress on the ESEA goals as well as the additional state goals.

Accountability for student achievement at the state and local levels is central to the 2001 reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. WDPI is committed to implementing the accountability provisions contained within the act. The department has adopted the following six ESEA performance goals and the core set of performance indicators required by USDE for each performance goal; other performance targets for these indicators will be included in the 2003-04 consolidated application, as noted.

ESEA Goals and Indicators

1. **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 1.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires state reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)

The categories specified in law (1111(b)(2)(C)(v)) are a subset of those referenced above. The department will rely upon federal guidance to clarify specific targeted groups' proficiency requirements as it relates to adequate yearly progress (AYP).
 - 1.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires state reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)).

See comment above

- 1.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.
2. **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 2.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.
 - 2.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
 - 2.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.
3. **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
 - 3.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
 - 3.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34).)
 - 3.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)
4. **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.
 - 4.1. Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the state.
5. **Performance goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.
 - 5.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.
 - 5.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

(Note: ESEA section 1907 requires states to report all LEA data regarding annual school dropout rates in the state disaggregated by race and ethnicity according to procedures that conform with the National Center for Educational Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data. Consistent with this requirement, states must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," i.e., a student in grades 9-12 who (a) was enrolled in the district at sometime during the previous school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the succeeding school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by the

state; (d) has not transferred to another public school district or to a non-public school or to a state-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or school-approved absence.

(Note: As it develops regulations or guidance for the Title I, Part A program, the Department will determine what, if any, modifications to Indicators 5.1 and 5.2 are needed to ensure conformance with Title I requirements.)

State Performance Targets

State established performance targets represent the progress the state expects to make with respect to each ESEA indicator and any additional goals and indicators the state has added to the five ESEA goals and corresponding indicators by specified dates.

Examples of hypothetical state performance targets:

- 1.1.1 (ESEA goal 1): The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who will be at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts consistent with the state's annual measurable objectives (e.g., "x" percent for 2002-03, "y" percent for 2003-04 for ensuring that all students reach this level by the end of the 2013-14 school year. (Note: The state annual measurable objectives for all students in reading/language arts are the same as those the state includes in its definition of adequate yearly progress.)
- 1.3.1 (ESEA goal 1): The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress will increase from the baseline established in 2001-2002 by "x" percent each subsequent year.
- 3.1.1. (ESEA goal 3): The percentage of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and in high-poverty schools, will increase from the baseline of "x" percent in 2001-2002 to "y" percent in 2002-2003, "z" percent in 2003-2004, etc.

Part II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs

States will conduct a number of activities to ensure effective implementation of the ESEA programs included in the consolidated application. Many of these state-level activities serve multiple programs. For example, a state may develop a comprehensive approach to monitoring and technical assistance that would be used for several (or all) programs. Part II encourages a comprehensive approach to program planning and implementation and suggests that information submitted for Part II of the application be done so across programs wherever possible.

Instructions: Describe state-level activities according to the requirements that follow. Responses to each item in this section shall be assumed to cover all programs included in the consolidated application unless otherwise indicated. When submitting a timeline, the timeline must describe the major milestones or key steps the state will carry out to meet the requirement. The timeline should provide enough information to demonstrate that all critical steps will be carried out in a timely way and that the state will be able to meet the requirement. Where applicable, states may include Web site references, electronic files, or other existing documentation to comply with the requirements listed in the application. (All electronic references and hyperlinks should point explicitly to applicable content.)

1. *Describe the state's system of standards, assessments, and accountability and provide evidence that it meets the requirements of the ESEA. In doing so—*

- a. *In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones, for either:*
 —*adopting challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1) or*
 —*disseminating grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the state's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.¹*

*By **May 1, 2003**, provide evidence that the state has adopted such standards or grade-level expectations.*

If the state already has standards or has disseminated grade-level expectations that meet the requirements, so state in June 2002 and provide evidence when it is requested, which will be in the fall of 2002, after the Department issues final regulations and guidance.

See c. below.

- b. *In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones, for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).*

Wisconsin, through Executive Order number 326, dated January 13, 1998, adopted challenging academic content standards in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards can be accessed at

<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/standards>

*By **May 1, 2003**, provide a detailed timeline for the above.*

¹ Consistent with final regulations, expected to be released in August 2002.

*No later than **May 1, 2006**, but as soon as available, provide evidence that the state has adopted challenging content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).*

If the state already has adopted science standards that meet the requirements of 1111(b)(1), so state in the June 2002 submission and provide evidence when it is requested, which will be in the fall of 2002, after the Department issues final regulations and guidance.

- c. *In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels.*

Wisconsin is completing various elements of a timeline waiver agreement approved by the USDE. Timeline waiver activities will be completed by June 2003. Wisconsin does not have grade level benchmarks at grades 3, 5, 6 or 7. Grade level benchmarks will be developed between July 2002 and May 2003. Wisconsin will develop new reading and math assessments at grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 beginning September 2003. The new assessments will be included in the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) by November 2005. The following is a schedule of major activities in the test development process:

Date	Activity
July 2002 – May 2003	Benchmarking at grade levels and test design.
September – December 2002	Item development 3 (R), Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
November 2002	Administration of Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
May 2002 – May 2003	Pilot testing items 3 (R), Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
March 2003	Administration of the Customized WRCT 3 (R).
April 2003 – June 2003	Reporting and Test Design Analysis at grade levels.
July 2003 – June 2004	Test format development and design at grade levels.
September – December 2003	Item development 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
November 2003	Administration of Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
May 2003 – May 2004	Pilot Testing items 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
March 2004	Administration of the Customized WRCT 3 (R).
April 2004 – June 2004	Reporting and Test Design Analysis at grade levels.
July 2004 – June 2005	Test Formatting and Forms Calibrations.
September – December 2004	Item development 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
November 2004	Administration of Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
November 2004	Forms Calibration 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M).
May 2004 – May 2005	Pilot Testing items 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
January – April 2005	Standard Setting 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M).
April – June 2005	Reporting and Test Design Analysis at grade levels
July 2005 – June 2006	Technical Analysis 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
September – December	Item development 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8,

Date	Activity
2005	10 (E, M, S, SS).
November 2005	Test Administration: 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
January – June 2006	Pilot Testing items 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
April – June 2006	Reporting 3, 5, 6, 7 (R/M) Enhanced WKCE 4, 8, 10 (E, M, S, SS).
May 2006	Evidence--validity/reliability/achievement standards setting process grades 3 – 8 and 10.

By **May 1, 2003**, provide a detailed timeline for the above.

No later than indicated in the **following schedule**, but as soon as available, provide evidence that the state has developed and implemented, in consultation with LEAs, assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels.

Assessments			
Subject	Grades	Implement By	Submit Evidence By
Math	3-8	2005-2006	December 2006
Rdg/LA	3-8	2005-2006	December 2006
Science	Elem (3-5), Middle (6-9); & High School (10-12)	2007-2008	December 2008

If the state has already implemented some or all of these assessments, so state in the June 2002 submission and provide evidence when it is requested, which will be in the fall of 2002, after the Department issues final regulations and guidance.

- d. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

Traditionally Wisconsin has used practitioners from LEAs and other education interest groups (e.g., teachers' unions, parent groups, business representatives) to assist in establishing student achievement standards. This practice will be sustained. Two sets of standard setting sessions are planned relative to the implementation of the new ESEA requirements.

Date	Activity
Session 1—February 2003 (Timeline waiver requirement)	Setting student achievement standards for English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies at grades 4, 8, and 10.
Session 2—February 2005	Setting achievement standards for reading and mathematics at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.
May 2006	Provide evidence to the USDE of the student achievement standards and the process it used to determine these standards.

By **May 1, 2003**, provide a detailed timeline for this.

*No later than indicated in the **following schedule**, but as soon as available, provide evidence that the state, in consultation with LEAs, has set academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).*

Academic Achievement Standards			
Subject	Grades	Implement By	Submit Evidence By
Math	3-8	2005-2006	December 2006
Rdg/LA	3-8	2005-2006	December 2006
Science	Elem (3-5), Middle (6-9); & High School (10-12)	2007-2008	December 2008

If the state has already set some or all of these academic achievement standards, so state in the June 2002 submission and provide evidence when it is requested, which will be in the fall of 2002, after the Department issues final regulations and guidance.

- e. *By **January 31, 2003**, describe how the state calculated its “starting point” as required for adequate yearly progress consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(E), including data elements and procedures for calculations.*

As noted above, Wisconsin is in a timeline waiver agreement with the USDE to enhance its current WKCE. The necessary changes will be in place by June 2003. Setting a starting point for the NCLB requirements during the 2001-02 school year would be inappropriate, since the 2001-02 examination is not enhanced to fully cover Wisconsin’s academic content standards. Wisconsin plans on identifying the adequate yearly progress (AYP) model it will use by January 31, 2004. Using the 2003-04 assessment data, Wisconsin will calculate the AYP starting point by January 31, 2004.

- f. *By **January 31, 2003**, provide the state’s definition of adequate yearly progress. The definition must include:*
- i. *For the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state’s proficient level, provide for reading/language arts and for mathematics—*
 - 1) *The starting point value;*
 - 2) *The intermediate goals;*
 - 3) *The timeline; and*
 - 4) *Annual objectives.*
 - ii. *The definition of graduation rate (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(c)(vi) and final regulations).*
 - iii. *One academic indicator for elementary schools and for middle schools.*
 - iv. *Any other (optional) academic indicators.*

The state superintendent has formed an internal AYP Development Committee. Before May 2003 this committee will develop an AYP model that will be used to hold schools and districts accountable, consistent with requirements under the NCLB.

Additionally, the state superintendent appointed an external ESEA Testing Advisory Committee made up of members from school districts, Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs), and the university system. This committee acts as a sounding board and provides counsel to the state superintendent on issues related to federal assessment requirements. All stages and components involved in the development and implementation of AYP will be filtered through this group.

The expected timeline for development of Wisconsin's AYP model is as follows:

Date	Activity
March 2002 to May 2003	Development of AYP models.
June 2003 to March 2004	Trial demonstration of AYP models.
January 31, 2004	Adoption of Wisconsin's AYP model.
May 2004	Final calculation of the state's starting point.
July 2004	Development of AYP communications and training.
November 2004	Application of the state's starting point. The new AYP definition will be applied to assessment data in the 2004-05 school year.
August to October 2004	Workshops for Wisconsin's school districts on AYP.

- g. *By **January 31, 2003**, identify the minimum number of students that the state has determined, based on sound statistical methodology, to be sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used and justify this determination.²*
- h. *In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a plan for how the state will implement a single accountability system that uses the same criteria, based primarily on assessments consistent with section 1111(b), for determining whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, regardless of whether the school receives Title I, Part A, or other federal funds.*

Section 115.38 (4) Wis. Stats., states, ... "the state superintendent shall identify those school districts that are low in performance and those schools in which there are pupils enrolled who do not meet the state minimum performance standards on the examinations administered under s. 118.30. The state superintendent shall make recommendations regarding how the programs and operations of the identified school districts and schools may be improved and periodically assess school district implementation of the recommendations."

Section 118.30, Wis. Stats., defines the state's examination system. The accountability requirements mandated by state law do not discriminate among the types of public schools (e.g., Title I schoolwide, Title I targeted assistance, non-Title I school, etc.) and put in place a single accountability system with the same criteria for all schools.

*By **May 2003**, provide evidence that the state has implemented a single accountability system consistent with section 1111(b) and 1116.*

² Consistent with final regulations, expected to be released in August 2002.

- i. *In the **June 2002 submission**, identify the languages present in the student population to be assessed, the languages in which the state administers assessments, and the languages in which the state will need to administer assessments. Use the most recent data available and identify when the data were collected.*

Wisconsin has over 87 different languages spoken in its public schools. Of these 87 different languages, approximately 90 percent come from two language groups: Spanish and Hmong. Limited English proficient (LEP) students comprise 3.3 percent of the state's students. Wisconsin has developed and will implement performance-based alternate assessments for students whose English language ability is too limited to participate in the state's examination. The state has also created inclusive accommodation criteria to assist districts in helping LEP students participate in the state's examinations. The state does not plan to develop statewide assessments in Spanish or Hmong, relying instead upon the quality alternate assessment system and broad accommodation criteria for the regular assessments identified above.

Languages spoken in Wisconsin public schools, taken from the March 2000 Census of Limited English Proficient Pupils in Wisconsin, are as follows:

Language	Total	PK	K-3	4-8	9-12
Afrikaans	18	0	6	9	3
Albanian	244	3	97	98	46
American Sign Language	17	7	7	3	0
Amharic	3	0	1	0	2
Arabic	177	2	72	68	35
Armenian	18	1	5	12	0
Bengali	5	0	3	1	1
Bulgarian	19	0	11	4	4
Cantonese	91	8	35	31	17
Creole or Patois	2	0	0	1	1
Croatian	18	1	3	10	4
Czech	17	0	10	6	1
Danish	5	0	5	0	0
Dutch	8	0	3	3	2
Farsi	20	0	8	8	4
Finnish	7	0	4	3	0
French	47	0	16	19	12
Georgian	1	0	0	1	0
German	47	1	20	13	13
Greek	20	0	10	7	3
Gujarati	31	0	14	10	7
Hebrew	9	0	4	4	1
Hindi	36	2	13	11	10
Hmong	11,877	552	5,174	4,524	1,627
Hungarian	6	0	3	1	2
Indonesian	6	0	3	2	1
Italian	22	0	10	7	5
Japanese	61	3	33	19	6
Kannada	2	0	2	0	0
Khmer	22	0	5	11	6
Khmu	110	0	31	57	22
Korean	206	0	86	87	33
Kurdi	11	2	0	5	4

Language	Total	PK	K-3	4-8	9-12
Lao	333	1	137	131	64
Latvian	4	0	1	1	2
Lithuanian	5	0	2	2	1
Macedonian	10	0	3	4	3
Malagasy	1	0	0	0	1
Malay	2	0	0	1	1
Maylayalam	3	0	2	0	1
Mandarin	142	4	67	53	18
Marshallese	1	0	0	0	1
Multiple	46	0	25	9	12
Nepali	12	0	5	5	2
Norwegian	14	2	2	8	2
Not on list	69	0	24	33	12
Other African	16	0	5	6	5
Other Chinese	41	2	16	13	10
Other South Asian	13	0	5	5	3
Polish	51	2	30	9	10
Portugese	44	0	15	14	15
Punjabi	72	2	29	24	17
Rumanian	20	1	13	3	3
Russian	265	3	91	108	63
Serbian	131	2	33	59	37
Serbo-Croatian	47	2	22	16	7
Sinhalese	1	0	1	0	0
Slovak	2	0	0	0	2
Somali	32	0	4	14	14
Spanish	12,154	458	5,288	4,286	2,122
Swahili	2	0	2	0	0
Swedish	11	0	6	4	1
Tagalog (Pilipino, Filipino)	54	4	14	23	13
Taiwanese	9	0	4	3	2
Tamil	7	0	2	5	0
Telugu	11	0	8	3	0
Thai	16	0	4	5	7
Tibetan	77	0	15	27	35
Tigrinya	1	0	0	1	0
Truk	4	0	3	1	0
Turkish	18	0	7	4	7
Ukrainian	24	0	10	10	4
Urdu	107	3	43	40	21
Vietnamese	127	1	40	52	34
Yoruba	2	0	1	1	0
Totals	27,184	1,069	11,673	10,018	4,424

- j. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide evidence that, beginning not later than the school year 2002-2003, LEAs will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency that meets the requirements of section 1111(b)(7) and 3116(d)(4), including assessment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension. Identify the assessment(s) the state will designate for this purpose.

Through revision of Chapter PI 13, Wisconsin Administrative Code, schools will be required to use departmentally-approved LEP assessments to annually evaluate English proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

- k. *In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the status of the state's effort to establish standards and annual measurable achievement objectives under section 3122(a) of the ESEA that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient children. These standards and objectives must relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension, and be aligned with the state academic content and student academic achievement standards as required by section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. If they are not yet established, describe the state's plan and timeline for completing the development of these standards and achievement objectives.*

The WDPI adopted (through Chapter PI 13, Wisconsin Administrative Code) English proficiency standards for students with limited English proficiency in 1985.

The WDPI plans to convene two statewide meetings to bring together Wisconsin English as a Second Language (ESL)/Bilingual educators. Participants will identify the requisite annual measurable achievement objectives to be applied to Wisconsin's LEP children. The WDPI will adopt annual achievement objectives for LEP children by September 2, 2002. Once adopted, the WDPI will conduct statewide workshops and training on the new achievement objectives and requirements.

*In the **May 2003 submission**, include the state's annual measurable achievement objectives.*

2. *In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the process for awarding competitive subgrants for the programs listed below. In a separate response for each of these programs, provide a description of the following items, including how the state will address the related statutory requirements:*
- timelines*
 - selection criteria and how they promote improved academic achievement*
 - priorities and how they promote improved academic achievement.*
- (In lieu of this description, the state may submit its RFP for the program.)*

The programs to be addressed are:

- 1a. Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3).
- 1b. Migrant Education Even Start (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3).
2. Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C).
3. Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2).
4. Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F).
5. Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—subgrants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3).
6. Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D).
7. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112).
8. Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126).
9. 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B).

WDPI will implement a similar process for all competitive subgrant programs. This process will be modified as necessary to comply with the requirements for each program. In general the process will include:

- Development of an application format for collection of consistent information from each applicant. This will include appropriate assurances.
- Uniform screening of applications for completeness and eligibility.
- External review of grant applications by an expert panel of practitioners.
- Internal review of applications by WDPI staff to verify the expert panel review findings to assure the appropriateness of the budget and other requirements. WDPI staff will forward application funding recommendations to the state superintendent for final decisions, followed by award notifications to applicants.

For each competitive grant program, WDPI will develop selection criteria consistent with the requirements of NCLB. Specific procedures and criteria for each competitive program follow.

1a. Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)

Introduction

Even Start Family Literacy (ESFL) is a family-centered program which embraces the whole family as “the student.” It serves families most in need. Those who have low income, who may have other issues such as domestic abuse, or alcohol and drug use and have at least one adult who lacks a high school diploma or its equivalent and who has at least one child birth-seven years of age. It provides participating families with an integrated program of early childhood education, adult education and basic skills instruction, parenting education, and interactive literacy activities between parents and their children. All projects have some home-based instruction and provide for the joint participation of parents and children. ESFL is a state-administered discretionary program.

The grant application guidelines and the scoring criteria will be sent to potential applicants to assist them in writing the application. This will help the applicants frame their proposal according to how they will be scored. Expectations will be clear.

The WDPI believes there is a high likelihood of success if:

- The applicant carries out a well written plan with collaborative partners who help work together to remove barriers to participation.
- The application’s plan is organized according to these criteria, such as including instructional programs based on scientifically-based reading research.
- The applicant provides highly trained staff participating in all components.
- The application has a comprehensive program with clearly stated objectives tied to appropriate measures.
- The evaluator and staff monitor and analyze their data to ensure that individual adults and students meet the state’s performance indicators of program quality and modify the instructional program for those who are not achieving.

Wisconsin’s ESFL Program will use an external review panel which includes the following representatives required by statute: an early childhood educator, an adult educator and someone who has experience in family literacy. Also included will be other members representing such groups as follows: community-based literacy organizations; parent-child education organizations;

business or industry with a commitment to education; local school boards; Title I, Part A or C programs; health and social services professionals, and religious and independent schools representative. A balance between rural and urban as well as race and gender will be considered. The review panelists will use the following schedule and selection criteria in determining grants to be awarded:

Review panelists will be provided with the following information: purpose of the Even Start Family Literacy Program; review of the materials provided to applicants; analysis of the required program components; and instruction on the two-step review process (point scale, providing feedback, and determining top ranking proposals).

Panelists will be given approximately two weeks to read and rate half of the Even Start Family Literacy applications. They will assess applications based on the statutory selection criteria and priorities in Section 1238 (a) of the ESEA that are provided to them in a WDPI form PI-1765-B (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/title1/pdf/1765-b.pdf>). A scale of 100 points will be used.

Panel Comes to Consensus During Review Process:

The reviewers will meet on two days. On the first day, each review group will meet to discuss and rank applications. The top ranked proposals that best meet the goals of the Even Start Family Literacy Program to serve families “most in need” will be chosen from each review group. The numerical score derived from the selection criteria provided will determine application ranking. If substantial scoring variance between the two review groups exists, the lowest score from the top ranking proposals will serve as the cut-off score for the second round of reviews. For example, if Group One’s lowest top ranking proposal scores 80, while the lowest top ranking proposal from Group Two scores 83, all applications from Group Two with a score of 80 or above will be included in the second round of reviews.

On Day 2, all panel members will review the top ranking applications (six or more). A new scoring procedure will be used to rank the proposals. Again, based on the selection criteria, panelists will be asked to give points to the highest-ranking application on down to one point for the lowest ranking application. The sum of all points will determine the final score. If substantial reviewer discrepancies ensue as in the case where one reviewer gives an application a score of six and another a score of one, panelists will be asked to come to consensus to determine final ranking. Recommendations for funding will then be forwarded to the department.

Final decisions regarding fund availability for applications will be determined by the level of federal dollars awarded to the state and the level of dollars needed to support continuing projects. Specifically, dollars available after continuing applications have been funded will determine the amount available for new and reapplying applications. The state superintendent will receive fund availability information, review panel recommendations, and data on all submitted applications to make final funding decisions.

a. Timelines

Even Start Family Literacy	
Date	Activity
December-January	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Review changes in law▪ Input from funded projects.▪ Input from family literacy intra and inter-agency colleagues.▪ Revise the application, guidelines and scoring criteria.

Even Start Family Literacy	
Date	Activity
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title I Committee of Practitioners (COP) review. Changes made to official forms. pdf file prepared by the first week in March. Prepare announcements to all appropriate parties. Prepare announcements for listserv(s).
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A pdf file is available for the ESFL application, guidelines and scoring criteria. Mail copies of application, guidelines and scoring criteria. Conduct grant writing workshop for technical assistance.
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select review panelists according to federal guidelines. Balance with urban, rural and racial and gender representation. Contact panelists for confirmation and logistics of the orientation and panel review meeting.
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications are due at DPI the first Friday of May. Applications logged in and prepared for panelists. Orientation of review panel. External review panel reads and rates grants in preparation for June's panel meeting. Review of continuing applications. Approval of continuing projects Estimate available money for new and reapplying grants
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External review panel meets in the first week of June to score and rank applications. Prepare charts, comments, and summaries of proceedings. Internal review of new and reapplying applications. Contingency letters, budget adjustments and recommendations prepared. Fiscal department reviews new and reapplying budgets. Summary charts prepared. Final recommendations to SEA leadership. Grant awards and approval letters are prepared.
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signed letters and grant awards mailed. Budget approval letters and information about fiscal reporting are prepared and sent to fiscal agent.
September-October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent, local evaluations reviewed State indicators of program quality will be reviewed for each project. Web site is updated to reflect new projects and grants awards.

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The panel will assess applications based on the statutory selection criteria and priorities in Section 1238 (a) of the ESEA that are provided to all applicants and to the review panel in a WDPI form PI-1765-B (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlseal/title1/pdf/1765-b.pdf>). Wisconsin's selection criteria document (PI-1765-B) will be revised to include under "Plan of Operation and Continuous Improvement" a statement that "the project will provide services for a three year age range in children." In addition, under "Budget" questions will be added: 1. Does this project appear to be cost effective? 2. Does this project's budget indicate that there is adequate local match?

In addition to showing need, the selection criteria promote improved academic achievement in the cooperation and coordination section and the plan of operation and continuous improvement.

For example: In the cooperation and coordination section the question is asked: “How will the project coordinate with the local school(s) to close the achievement gap?” It also inquires: “Does the narrative describe how the proposed activities will be coordinated with programs assisted under Title I Part A, and any other parts of ESEA and any relevant programs under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the Head Start Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Act?” This coordination of resources increases the support for improving academic achievement.

Examples in the Plan of Operation and Continuous Improvement section that promote increased academic achievement are:

1. A likelihood of success in effectively implementing the 15 required program elements. These have been provided in this state plan as [Appendix C](#).
2. The plan contains clear, measurable objectives against which the progress of success of the project will be measured;
3. Includes appropriate activities, services and timelines to meet those objectives;
4. Designates responsibilities to specific staff who are qualified to administer and implement the project and provide specialized training to prepare staff to work in the program; awareness of the requirements regarding staff qualifications;
5. Provides continuity of services, programming year round based upon scientifically based research, and home-based instruction;
6. Uses equitable, gender fair, multicultural materials, examples, and models
7. Provides accommodations for children and adults with disabilities, and provides translation and support services for those with limited English proficiency;
8. Provides for collection and reporting of state indicators of program quality and individual performance indicators for continuous program improvement;
9. Addresses what the intended impact of the project is on helping to close the achievement gap, especially for people of color and those in poverty.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement.

The priority factors in the application are:

1. The application demonstrates that the area to be served has a percentage or a large number of families who are in need of family literacy services. Indicators include: high levels of poverty, undereducation, unemployment, limited English proficiency, migratory families, high number of parents who are victims of domestic violence, or a high number who are receiving assistance under TANF.

High poverty and the other issues mentioned above put families especially at risk of unemployment, undereducation, substance abuse, etc and those barriers need to be removed in order to break negative intergenerational cycles.

2. The application shows that the area to be served is designated as an empowerment zone or an enterprise community.

These areas of the state are “particularly needy” and children and their parents are most at risk for failing to meet high academic and performance standards, be unemployed or suffer other indicators of high poverty areas.

3. The application proposes a strong collaborative project that builds upon existing community resources of high quality to create a range of services integrating early childhood education, adult education, and parent education as well as parent-child literacy activities into a unified program.

Solid coordination of human and dollar resources increases the likelihood of improved academic achievement.

The SEA will add priority points to applications that review panelists agree meet these criteria.

1b.Migrant Education Even Start Program (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)

Migrant Education Even Start (MEES) is funded from a 3% set-aside of the Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 ESFL Demonstration grants program. Families served in the project are defined in Title I, Part C of the ESEA. Migrant families travel across school district and state boundaries with their children to perform work in farming, dairy, fishing, timber, and related processing industries. Grants are made directly to projects in areas that include significant concentrations of migrant agricultural families with children from birth to age eight. Projects must provide a unified program of family literacy services consisting of early childhood education, adult basic education or English language instruction, parenting education, and interactive literacy activities between parents and children. Previous projects have employed a variety of strategies to engage and retain highly mobile migrant families, including traveling teachers, computer loans, mobile learning centers, and portable curricula. The goals of the program are to improve adult literacy, prepare young children for academic success, and support parents in their role as their child's first teacher. The application and review processes will follow the preceeding Even Start Family Literacy program procedures.

2. Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)

Introduction

The Title I, Part C Migrant Education program is a state administered and operated categorical program. The state allocates these funds only to those districts with identified migrant student populations enrolled in their schools. The funds help migrant students overcome the challenges of mobility, limited-English proficiency, and other difficulties associated with a migratory life in order to succeed in school.

a. Timelines

Education of Migrant Children	
Date	Activity
January-March	▪ Statewide needs assessment.
March	▪ New Generation System (NGS) Student Record Training Workshop.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Migrant Recruiters' Workshop.
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Migrant summer application sent out to LEAs. ▪ Migrant National Conference/National PASS Center Meeting. ▪ Migrant Directors' Meeting. ▪ Summer grant award estimates announced.
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Identification & Recruitment Meeting.
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Migrant summer applications due to DPI – June 1. ▪ Read summer applications. ▪ Summer application approvals sent to LEAs. ▪ Regular term grant awards mailed.
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Send out summer end-of-project evaluations. ▪ Regular term application due (part of ESEA Consolidated Plan). ▪ Migrant summer inservice. ▪ Technical assistance review of summer migrant programs. ▪ Exit Level Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Testing (TAAS).
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Migrant End-of-Year Reports due. ▪ Technical assistance/review of summer migrant programs. ▪ Exit Level TAAS.
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Migrant Farmworkers' Joint Conference. ▪ Binational Conference. ▪ Regular term applications processed. ▪ Summer migrant end-of-project evaluations due.
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PASS Interstate Coordination Meeting. ▪ Interstate Secondary Credit Accrual Meeting-Texas.
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual migrant student count.
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Performance Reports due to USDE. ▪ National PASS Center Meeting.

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The migrant education program is intended to ensure that migrant students in Wisconsin—

- Receive appropriate instructional and support services that address their special needs.
- Have the same opportunity to meet state content and student performance standards all children are expected to meet.
- Benefit from state and local systemic reform, and
- Successfully transition to postsecondary education or employment.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The WDPI migrant education staff will review applications to determine if the programs and service delivery systems are focused on needs assessment and the priorities established by the state and have the potential for making a difference in a student's academic progress. The criteria for local programs will be congruent with the performance goals and performance targets established in the state's consolidated program. Successful plans will set forth a clear vision of how migrant students will be provided with instructional strategies, quality curriculum, and assessments.

Projects will need to demonstrate integration and coordination of federal, state, and local resources. Using local needs assessment summary, the proposal will identify objectives and an action plan outlining numbers and needs of students to be served. The projects include provision for involving parents in the education of their children, including informing them of their children's academic progress.

After the initial grant review, the WDPI will advise grant applicants, as needed, how to strengthen their plans to better promote student achievement and progress toward attainment of the high standards. The WDPI will also provide systematic review of staff employed at the LEA level with migrant education funds to ensure their migrant students will receive instruction from highly qualified teachers.

3. Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)

Introduction

The ESEA provides support to states, local agencies and schools for supplemental programs that meet the special educational needs of children and youth who are neglected or delinquent [N or D] or at-risk. Title I, Part D is comprised of two programs: grants made to state agencies responsible for serving children and youth in residential and nonresidential institutions, including those in adult correctional facilities; and grants to local agencies that provide services to youth in local correctional facilities who are at risk of educational failure.

a. Timelines

Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs	
Date	Activity
Spring	▪ Neglected and Delinquent sponsored workshop.
May	▪ Send application grants to coordinators for the N & D institutions/LEA or CESA.
June & July	▪ Applications are to be received at DPI.
July and August	▪ Given to consultant to read when received.
July, August, September, and October	▪ Consultant reviews application for approval.
July, August, September and October	▪ Send to Fiscal Department for fiscal review.
	▪ Following Fiscal review and approval, letter is sent out to institution or LEA.
October	▪ Annual Count of Pupils – due to SEA in December.
January	▪ Annual Count Report goes to USDE.

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The amount of funds that are available for development of programs at local institutions serving school age neglected or delinquent pupils is allocated on a formula not a competitive basis. The annual survey provides a documented count which generates the funding level. The annual survey

also generates the student count, which determines the funding level for state correctional programs.

The SEA notifies districts that have neglected or delinquent pupil-serving institutions within their boundaries of the amount of funds available and of the process for making applications. The state sub-allocates the state agency allocation for juvenile and adult correctional institutions to the Wisconsin Department of Corrections.

state consultants review all applications to ensure the following required components have been adequately addressed.

- Evidence of a signed formal agreement between the applicant agency and local residential institution.
- Description of transition plan to be employed as students leave the institution.
- Agreement to meet assurances required under PL107,110; submission of an appropriate fiscal plan to utilize the funds to support the education of neglected or delinquent students.
- Complete narrative responses to all required descriptions of how the program and plan of services will be carried out to impact the academic and support needs of the neglected or delinquent student population.

The SEA, as advised by the Title I Committee of Practitioners, has established formula-based allocation procedures for Title I Part D, Subpart 1 and Subpart 2 programs.

Subpart 1-Juvenile and Adult Correctional Programs

The SEA suballocates the Subpart 1 funds to The Wisconsin Department of Corrections who has the responsibility for institutions providing educational programs in the juvenile and adult correctional facilities. The Department of Corrections as the state applicant agency receives an allocation based on the verified annual student count of number of children/youth under 21, enrolled in a regular program of instruction supported by state funds for at least 15 hours per week. The correctional institutions are those facilities in which persons are confined as a result of a conviction for a criminal offense, including persons less than 21 years of age.

The formula determining the funds awarded for the state juvenile and adult correctional institutions is derived by multiplying the enrollment in the institutions meeting the definition of a juvenile or adult correctional facility times the number of days per year the educational program operates, divided by 180, which yields an adjusted enrollment figure. This figure is submitted to the federal government annually and it generates the allocation coming to the state for Subpart 1 programming. Once the state has taken off the allowable 1% administration and the 2% program improvement, the balance is allocated to the state applicant agency (SAA). The needs assessment completed by the central division of the state corrections department will be used by that agency to determine numbers and needs and funding levels to be established for the institutions selected for service.

The state applicant agency submits an application to the state education department outlining the institutions under its auspices that will receive Title I funding. At each of these institutions there is a regular program of education and the Title I Part D funds will be used to supplement the state program. There are two parts to the application, which outline how the SAA has conducted a needs assessment to determine the numbers and needs prior to setting its priorities for institutions to be served. The second part of the application is a section completed by each institution describing the

program goals, outcomes, instructional program to impact student achievement, numbers to be served, parent involvement, plan to meet the assurances, transition plan, and fiscal plan for the ensuing program year. The plan for evaluation is outlined, as well as provision of information on the results from the previous year and how this information will be used to improve program services.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

After the SEA staff have reviewed the applications, formal notification is forwarded to the applicant of approval or whether more information is needed before the approval process may be completed. Technical assistance is given as needed to strengthen these applications.

4. Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)

Introduction

The purpose of CSR is to provide annual competitive grants for local schools to develop and implement whole-school comprehensive reforms, based upon scientifically-based research and effective practices that help ensure all children will meet Wisconsin's academic achievement standards.

a. Timelines

Comprehensive School Reform	
Date	Activity
Summer – Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSR grant writing workshops. CESA or local district sponsored data retreats.
August – September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current CSR applications maintained on WDPI website. Direct mailing of CSR program announcement to district administrators, CESAs, and principals of schools identified for improvement.
March, First Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSR competitive grant application deadline.
March – April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial screening (Step 1).
April – May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review panel for grant reading (Step 2).
April – May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal review. WDPI conducts telephone interviews to clarify any questions/concerns (Step 3).
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations to state superintendent. grant award notification (Step 4).

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The WDPI will ensure that funded projects target appropriate priorities and meet the other requirements in the NCLB. The WDPI mails grant announcement letters to all school district administrators, CESAs, and to all principals of schools identified for improvement and provides an electronic version on its website at www.dpi.state.wi.us/dlsea/sit/scriintro.html. The department's web page will maintain links to related national, regional, and local CSR grant resources along with current information on Wisconsin's CSR school projects. Completed annual applications must be submitted to the WDPI by the first Friday of March, with a July 1 funding date.

Step 1: Initial Screening

Annually, local schools submit their initial CSR applications to the WDPI on or before the first Friday of March. In an initial screening, WDPI will review to ensure completeness and that all eleven components, as required by the legislation, NCLB, are fully-addressed. The screening will include review of the proposed scientifically-based research model(s), and the effective practices to ensure that the research cited is valid, credible, and adheres to the criteria of the USDE.

Each application will be further reviewed to ensure evidence that:

- the school's plan is based on comprehensive needs assessment data (including documentation of participation in a recent data retreat);
- program goals are based on needs assessment; and
- the school's CSR program budget reflects implementation of data-based decisions.

The application will include a program goal-related budget, the school's needs assessment data, and a full description of how the reform program will be used to increase student achievement.

Finally, the application will be reviewed for evidence of support from a high-quality external technical assistance provider.

WDPI will return incomplete applications with a letter stating the reasons for not being accepted and offer technical assistance for the next year's grant competition.

Step 2: Review Panel

If the school application includes all eleven of the federally legislated components, the district and school applications will be evaluated by a grant review panel consisting of external experts and WDPI staff. Under the direction of the state superintendent, key organizations (i.e., Wisconsin's Association of School District Administrators, Wisconsin Education Association, Wisconsin Parent Teacher Association, Wisconsin Federation of Teachers, Wisconsin School Boards Association, Wisconsin Title I Association, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, and former CSR project participants) will be invited to participate in the review process. These organizations will provide volunteers that have expertise in Wisconsin educational practice, policy, and school reform. In forming the review panel, the state superintendent will strive for gender, ethnic, and geographic representation.

The external review panel members will be notified of the grant reading dates by the first week in April. This notification will include background materials, guidance on the CSR application process, information from the *Catalog of School Reform Models*, a copy of the CSR grant application and other WDPI resources. The review panel will meet to evaluate which submitted applications meet the high standards required in the CSR legislation and by the WDPI.

The WDPI has developed a review process that uses a set of technical benchmarks with matching indicators. The review panel members will be briefed on the CSR program and its federal guidelines. Discussion will include the competitive grant process, selection criteria, and strategies to ensure that only high-quality CSR programs implementing scientifically-based reforms and effective practices are funded. The team members' instruction will also include a "walk-through" of a sample CSR application. WDPI staff will address any questions or concerns panel members may have related to the applications or the grant process.

The review panel as a whole will rank the individual school applications by the total score. The rank order of schools will identify which schools are Title I eligible and which schools are not. Only Title I eligible schools will be eligible for CSR funds. The non-Title I eligible schools will be eligible for only the Funds for the Improvement of Education. The review panel will provide the state superintendent with a list of recommended schools for funding and those that should not be funded. The WDPI staff will solicit feedback from the review panel members on how to improve future LEA/school applications and the CSR grant review process.

Step 3: Internal Review

All applications and review materials will be returned to the WDPI staff and appropriate information will be entered into a spreadsheet. After all applications have been reviewed and scored by the external panel, the WDPI staff will consider which applications meet the standards for high quality listed in the legislation and which do not. The applications will also be reviewed for consistency, assurances, valid budgets, and geographic location. A formal telephone interview may be conducted, when appropriate, with applicants where there are still concerns or questions. This interview may also be used to discuss the funding level in an applicant's proposal. A timeline will be provided in order for applicants to supply additional information and/or to address any budgetary concerns. After the interviews have been completed, the WDPI staff will summarize the recommended proposals for funding and the amount of each grant award.

Step 4: State Superintendent Review and Grant Award

The WDPI staff will forward a list of the recommended grant award recipients to the state superintendent for final review and approval. The state superintendent will use the CSR review panel members' recommendations to determine which applications will be funded. Grant award letters will be mailed to school districts from the Office of the State Superintendent and include the approved level of funding for the application.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The WDPI will give priority to ensure that schools selected have the highest need and are committed to implementing a high-quality, scientifically-based research program with effective practices that have the greatest chance to improve student academic achievement. The WDPI will ensure that only Title I eligible schools receive the Title I portion of the CSR funds. The state superintendent will designate a priority status by awarding twenty (20) additional points to any school that has been identified as schools identified for improvement or in any school needing corrective action, under Title I, Part A. Only those applications that include the eleven components in the federal legislation and a comprehensive school reform program, based upon scientifically-based research and effective practices, will be considered for funding. The state superintendent will also, to the greatest extent possible, ensure that

there is a balance between rural and urban schools, as well as balance among schools serving elementary, middle, and high school students.

5. Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3)

Introduction

The purpose of the Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting higher education competition is to award eligible partnerships with subgrants to provide professional development activities and to support local educational agencies in developing and providing assistance for sustained, high-quality professional development. All proposed activities must be scientifically-based and be designed to improve teachers' knowledge in the core academic subjects of arts, civics and government, economics, English, foreign languages, geography, history, mathematics, reading or language arts, and science.

a. Timelines

Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund— Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships	
Date	Activity
June	■ Publish on University of Wisconsin System (UWS) website and distribute ESEA higher education RFP and proposal guidelines.
End of October	■ Proposal submission deadline.
November	■ Initial proposal screening (Step 1).
First weekend in December	■ Review committee meeting (Step 2).
December	■ ESEA higher education grant coordinator conducts final review to clarify any question or concerns (Step 3).
First week of January	■ Recommendations made to University of Wisconsin System Academic Affairs Vice President (Step 4).
Mid-January	■ Subgrant Awards Announced.

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

Step 1: Initial Proposal Screening

On or before October 31 of each year, eligible partnerships will be formed and proposals will be submitted to the ESEA Title II higher education grant program coordinator at the University of Wisconsin. The coordinator will conduct an initial screen of each proposal. In this screening, each proposal will be reviewed to ensure completeness and compliance with all aspects required in the federal education legislation, NCLB, and with related federal policies and requirements. The screening will verify that the submission is from a qualified eligible partnership; that the professional development activities conform with scientifically-based research, and are those activities set forth under the law. Each proposal will be reviewed to ensure that the activities respond to the professional development needs of teachers related to student achievement in the core academic subjects and are the result of a collaborative planning process among the proposing institution and the division that prepares teachers, a school of arts and sciences, and a high-need local education agency. The proposal will also be reviewed with respect to adherence to the University of Wisconsin System

(UWS) academic affairs policies. Proposals that do not meet the requirements are returned to the author with an explanation of the deficiency.

Each budget will be examined to ensure that it conforms to all criteria of the USDE and the UWS fiscal policies.

Step 2: Review Committee

A proposal that has met all requirements of the initial proposal screening will be evaluated by an ESEA Title II Higher Education Grant Proposal Review Committee. This committee will consist of approximately 18 members representative of the following:

- University of Wisconsin institutions.
- Independent colleges and universities in Wisconsin.
- University of Wisconsin System Administration.
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.
- Wisconsin elementary school teachers.
- Wisconsin middle school teachers.
- Wisconsin secondary school teachers.
- Non-profit organizations in the state.

Ethnic, gender, geographic, and subject matter represented will be sought when selecting the committee.

Criteria by which proposals will be evaluated and ranked by the review committee include:

- Significance and documentation of the needs being addressed.
- Clarity and significance of project objectives.
- Focus of professional development on increasing student achievement levels.
- Involvement of the intended beneficiaries in the planning of the program.
- Overall design of the proposed project.
- Scientifically-based research cited.
- Best practices model(s) identified.
- Qualifications of project personnel.
- Clear and appropriate budget.
- Likelihood of sustainability of project after funding has expired.
- Plans for project evaluation.

■ Geographical distribution of grants.

By the middle of November, annually, each committee member will be assigned a set of proposals to review.

Each proposal will be evaluated by a minimum of three members of the review committee using the proposal evaluation form. Proposals will be mailed to committee members so that an initial evaluation can be done prior to the committee meeting. The program coordinator will assign the specific evaluators for each proposal and will try to have reviewers evaluate proposals in their own academic area but not from their own institution.

The review committee will meet the first Friday and Saturday in December. At the meeting of the review committee, members will hold a general discussion Friday afternoon to review the program objectives, policies, and procedures. The coordinator will discuss selected portions of proposals as examples. There will be a brief overview discussion of proposed projects. Committee members will meet in small groups to discuss selected proposals. Individual members will complete a final review for each of their proposals. Committee members will record points awarded through their ratings and give the list of scores to the coordinator. The program coordinator will use the total points from each individual evaluation to determine mean ratings and a range of scores for each proposal. The proposals will be ranked using the means and possibly other measures as well. The ranked lists, along with the range of scores for each proposal, will be reported to the committee on Saturday morning. The committee will discuss the overall ranked list and specific proposals, particularly those with larger ranges for the scores and those that are near the cut-off point for funding. If necessary, the committee will recess so that members can have additional time to study proposals that are still being discussed. After reconvening, the proposals will again be considered by the committee. A final list will be determined by consensus. This list will include the following categories: highly recommended for funding; moderately recommended for funding, and not recommended for funding. At the close of the meeting, reviewers will give their completed proposal evaluation forms to the program coordinator.

Step 3: Final Considerations

During December, the program coordinator will contact proposal authors identified by the review committee. The contacts will be via E-mail or telephone. The purpose of these contacts will be for revision in budgets and other matters prior to final recommendations for funding. By early January the coordinator will report the results of the review committee, have follow-up discussions with selected proposal authors, and report recommendations to the UWS Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Step 4: Grant Award

The UWS Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs will make the final decision on the recommended proposals to be funded. The final award notification letter will come directly from the office of the UWS Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. This award notification letter will identify the amount of the subgrant and the programmatic and fiscal reports that are required.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The WDPI and UWS will give priority to proposals that have the greatest identified need and use scientifically-based research and best practices to provide high quality professional development to improve student academic achievement. First, the eligible partnership will be

required to have a high need LEA as a member. Second, the needs in the proposal will be reported with respect to student achievement. Third, the proposed activities will be embedded in scientifically-based research and best practices. Finally, the review committee and the program coordinator will ensure that there is a geographical distribution of funded projects.

6. Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)

Introduction

The purposes of the Enhancing Education through Technology (Ed Tech) are to:

- Assist states and localities in implementing and supporting a comprehensive system that effectively uses technology in elementary and secondary schools.
- Improve student academic achievement.
- Encourage the establishment or expansion of initiatives (including those involving public-private partnerships) that are designed to increase access to technology, particularly in schools served by “high-need local educational agencies.”
- Assist states and localities in the acquisition, development, interconnection, implementation, improvement, and maintenance of an effective educational technology infrastructure in a manner that expands access of technology to students (particularly disadvantaged students) and teachers.

Included activities are for professional development, family involvement, and the evaluation of student achievement based on the information and technology literacy standards.

The state superintendent has appointed an advisory committee made up of professionals from the field representing University of Wisconsin institutions, independent colleges and universities, the Wisconsin Educational Media Association (WEMA), other professional organizations, and the community of school districts with representation from districts of different sizes and geographic locations. This committee has made recommendations on priorities of the programs including the targeted activities for the competitive process and the RFP.

The local Wisconsin Ed Tech process will ensure that funded projects target appropriate priorities and meet the other requirements in the NCLB. The WDPI will provide updated electronic versions of Ed Tech grant applications. A statewide grant announcement letter and application will be mailed to all school district administrators and CESAs. Specific Ed Tech applications for the district level are also available on the DPI website at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dltel/imt/index.html>. The department’s web page maintains links to related national, regional, and local technology grant resources along with current information on Wisconsin’s Ed Tech projects. Past projects from the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) are also available online. Completed annual applications must be submitted to the WDPI by the first Friday of February with a July 1 funding date.

Wisconsin’s Ed Tech competitive grant process will consist of four main steps:

Step 1: Initial Screening

Annually, local schools must submit their initial Ed Tech applications to the WDPI on or before the first Friday of February. WDPI staff will screen each application. In this initial screening,

WDPI staff will review each application to ensure completeness and that all components, as required in the federal education legislation, NCLB, are addressed in the grant application.

Each application is further reviewed to ensure evidence that the school's educational technology plan identifies district needs and program goals based on comprehensive needs assessment data. In addition, the program budget must reflect implementation of data-based decisions. The application must include a program goal-related budget, the school's needs assessment data, and a full description of how the educational technology program will be used to increase student achievement.

Applications that do not address all of the federal components or that do not have an educational technology plan based on data from a needs assessment will be returned with a letter stating the reasons for its return. A copy of the technical assistance review will also be provided. WDPI offers technical assistance for schools preparing for the next year's grant competition.

Step 2: Review Panel

After the application has been determined to possess all of the federally legislated components, the applications are evaluated by a grant review panel that consists of external experts. Under the direction of the state superintendent, key organizations (i.e., University of Wisconsin institutions, Independent colleges and universities, University of Wisconsin System Administration, Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, the CESA Instructional Technology Services council (CITSC), the Wisconsin Association of Distance Education Networks (WADEN), WEMA, elementary teachers, middle school teachers, secondary teachers, non-profit organizations, former Ed Tech project participants, and the Wisconsin Council of Religious and Independent Schools) are invited to participate in the review process. These organizations will provide volunteers who have expertise in Wisconsin educational practice and policy, and educational technology. In forming the review panel, the state superintendent strives for gender, ethnic and geographic diversity representation.

The WDPI review panel members are notified of the grant reading dates by the first week in March. This notification includes background materials, such as the Ed Tech guidance, a copy of the Ed Tech grant application and other WDPI resources. The review panel will meet with the sole purpose of evaluating which submitted applications meet the high standards required in the Ed Tech legislation and by the WDPI.

The WDPI has developed a review process to assure a fair rating system for applicants. A set of technical benchmarks with matching indicators is utilized in the evaluation. The review panel members are briefed on the Ed Tech program and its federal guidelines. Discussion includes the competitive grant process, selection criteria, and strategies to ensure that only high-quality Ed Tech programs implementing effective educational technology practices are funded. The team members' instruction also includes a "walk-through" of a sample Ed Tech application. WDPI staff will address any questions or concerns panel members may have related to the applications or the grant process.

The review panel members are divided into three person teams to evaluate and award points to each of the applications. The applications are divided among the teams maintaining impartiality in the assignments. The WDPI staff select team leaders to be responsible for receiving and returning applications and evaluation forms. Each person individually reads and scores the applications. Teams then discuss the strengths and weaknesses found. Teams then review their individual scores for each component of the application as well as the overall application score.

When the team members disagree, the team will determine the overall total score in one of two ways. First, by reaching a consensus through discussion of the application, identifying areas of concern from each of the individual members, and by agreeing on a team final score. Second, if consensus is not reached, the group may average the individual scores to determine a group score. If scores of individual team members show a variation of ten points or more, another team will read and score the application. Team members are rotated each half day to avoid problems of complacency.

The WDPI staff solicits feedback from the review panel members and the Ed Tech Advisory Committee on how to improve future LEA/school applications and/or the Ed Tech grant review process.

Step 3: Internal Review

All applications and review materials will be returned to the WDPI staff and appropriate information will be entered into a spreadsheet. After all applications have been reviewed and scored by the external panel, the WDPI staff will consider which applications meet the standards for high quality listed in the legislation and which do not. The applications will also be reviewed for consistency, assurances, valid budgets, and geographic location. A formal telephone interview may be conducted, when appropriate, with applicants where there are still concerns or questions. This interview may also be used to discuss the funding level in an applicant's proposal. A timeline will be provided in order for applicants to supply additional information and/or to address any budgetary concerns. After the interviews have been completed, the WDPI staff will summarize the recommended proposals for funding and the amount of each grant award.

Step 4: State Superintendent Review and Grant Award

After review by the Ed Tech Advisory Committee, the WDPI staff will forward a list of the recommended grant applications to the state superintendent for final review and approval. The state superintendent uses the Ed Tech review panel's scoring and WDPI staff recommendations to finalize the list of LEAs to be funded. Official notification of grant awards will be mailed to LEAs from the Office of the State Superintendent. This final award notification identifies the approved level of funding for the LEA and defines its responsibilities.

Competitive Preferences

The WDPI will give priority to applicants with the highest need, based on census poverty level and need for technology based on needs assessment and survey data, that are committed to implementing a high-quality, research program(s) with effective practices that improve student academic achievement and promote the state superintendent's New Wisconsin Promise. The state superintendent will designate a priority status by awarding additional points to any school that has been identified as a school in need of improvement or in need of corrective action, under Title I, Part A or State Accountability, NCLB. Additional points will be awarded to any district which raises the level of professional development from 25 percent to as high as 50 percent. The state superintendent will to the greatest extent possible, ensure that there is a balance between the rural and urban districts. A geographic distribution throughout the state based on the twelve CESA regions will also be considered.

Wisconsin's Ed Tech subgrants will only be awarded to eligible local entities. These are defined as follows:

An eligible local entity is either a "high-need local educational agency" or an "eligible local partnership".

A “high-need local educational agency” is an LEA that –

- (1) Is among those LEAs in the State with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line;

In Wisconsin this is determined to be LEAs with eleven percent (11%) or more of their children from families with incomes below the poverty line. This is the average for the state based on data from the US Census web site at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/schooltoc.html> as provided in the final guidance for the Educational Technology State Grants program. A list of these districts has been prepared.

and

- (2) Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 of the ESEA,

Wisconsin has compiled a list of these schools and to meet this criterion an LEA must have a school on that list.

or

has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology.

The need for this assistance has been identified from annual technology surveys and needs assessments which are conducted as part the LEA technology planning process.

An “eligible local partnership” is a partnership that includes at least one high-need LEA *and* at least one of the following –

- (1) An LEA that can demonstrate that teachers in its schools are effectively integrating technology and proven teaching practices into instruction, based on a review of relevant research, and that the integration results in improvement in classroom instruction and in helping students meet challenging academic standards.

An institution of higher education that is in full compliance with the reporting requirements of section 207(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and that has not been identified by the State as low-performing under that act.

- (2) A for-profit business or organization that develops, designs, manufactures, or produces technology products or services or has substantial expertise in the application of technology in instruction.
- (3) A public or private nonprofit organization with demonstrated expertise in the application of educational technology in instruction.

The partnership may also include other LEAs, educational service agencies, libraries, or other educational entities appropriate to provide local programs.

a. Timelines

Year one will be as follows:

Enhancing Education Through Technology	
Date	Activity

Enhancing Education Through Technology	
Date	Activity
June 7	▪ State Superintendent's Ed Tech Advisory Committee meeting
June 7-June 10	▪ Complete Ed Tech RFP
June 21	▪ Ed Tech RFP(application) posted to web site for distribution to LEAs (draft can be viewed at http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/esea/pdf/pi_9770.pdf)
June 25-27	▪ Information to applicants via distance (16 sites)
August 2	▪ Applications due to WDPI
August 6-15	▪ Initial screening (Step 1)
August 27-29	▪ External review panel application reading (Step 2)
Sept. 1-15	▪ Internal review/ phone interviews (Step 3)
Sept. 23-30	▪ Recommendations to state superintendent/grant award notification (Step 4)

Timeline for Future Years:

Enhancing Education Through Technology	
Date	Activity
Fall	▪ Ed Tech grant writing workshops. ▪ CESA or local district sponsored data retreats.
November – December	▪ Current Ed Tech applications maintained on WDPI website. ▪ Direct mailing of Ed Tech program announcement. ▪ Letters to district administrators and CESAs.
February, First Friday	▪ Ed Tech competitive grant application deadline.
February - March	▪ Initial screening (Step 1).
March	▪ External review panel for grant reading (Step 2).
April	▪ Internal review. ▪ WDPI conducts telephone interviews to clarify any questions/concerns (Step 3).
May	▪ Recommendations to state superintendent. ▪ Grant award notification (Step 4).

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

(Note: Additional selection criteria may be developed based on the recommendation of the “Ed Tech” Advisory committee and the direction of the State Superintendent of Schools.)

Criteria 1: Does the application provide evidence of success that shows the model that the applicant is proposing has raised student academic performance in other locations or situations; OR, is this project a part of a comprehensive, high-quality research study designed to show whether promising instructional technology practices raise student achievement? This meets the emphasis on research-based solutions in NCLB. This will ensure funding of solutions that have been proven to raise student achievement or projects which significantly raise our knowledge about which practices raise student achievement and which don't.

Criteria 2: Is research-based professional development a substantial part of the project as measured by the percent of funding spent on it? Current state needs assessments (LoTI, 1999-present; Metiri Study, 2000) suggest that effective instructional use of educational technology

has not permeated Wisconsin's classrooms enough to make a difference. If classroom practice does not change, it is unreasonable to expect a change in student achievement. Only by educating our educators in proven (research-based) instructional techniques including educational technology, can we expect to improve student performance.

Criteria 3 Is the school identified as a school in need of improvement or a school in need of corrective action? These schools are identified as such because of a particular need to improve student achievement.

c. *Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement.*

(In lieu of this description, the state has submitted its RFP for the program below)

http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/esea/pdf/pi_9770.pdf

7. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, Section 4112)

The Governor's designee for this portion of the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program is the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services. The following outlines the timelines, selection criteria and priorities for this section of Title IV A.

- a. Timeline
- b. Selection Criteria
- c. Priorities

Introduction

The following information has been developed by the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services, designated by the Office of the Governor to administer the Governor's Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program. Federal guidelines under this application requests a description of the process used for awarding competitive subgrants and to provide a separate response for each of the programs being awarded describing the timeline, selection criteria, and how the program promotes improved academic achievement.

The Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) has established contracting and award procedures to ensure the proper use of public funds and to get dollars and services to the recipient in the most timely, effective, and efficient manner possible. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and Department of Health and Family Services each have established policies, procedures, and service priorities developed for making grant awards. Each Department has an established service delivery infrastructure developed to meet their unique mission and charge. While the Department of Public Instruction has developed its infrastructure to meet specific education needs of Wisconsin's youth, the Department of Health and Family Services has established a community based service delivery infrastructure to promote community responsibility, protect vulnerable children, adults and families, prevent individual and social problems, strengthen families, and to foster the development of healthy, self-reliant individuals.

Due to variations between the two organizations, a general summary of the DHFS award and contracting process is provided to clarify how funds are prioritized and delivered. This is followed by a general description of the methods used to help the department establish its needs

and priorities, ending with a summary of program areas to be supported through the Governor's Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program.

Summary of DHFS Award and Contracting Process

The Department of Health and Family Services utilizes a service delivery infrastructure created under Wisconsin Act 51. Act 51 created an infrastructure of local county governmental service delivery organizations commonly referred to as "Human Service" or "Community Service" agencies. Each county governing board is required to establish one of these service delivery agencies responsible for the provision of substance abuse prevention and treatment services, mental health and developmental disability services. Administrative rules are established governing the delivery of substance abuse prevention services. As required under DHFS Administrative Rule 75, the delivery of these services must be coordinated with those services provided by local educational agencies. As a condition of funding, all local service providers will address how their projects are coordinated with other youth service organizations within the target area, including educational agencies. The majority of DHFS substance abuse and violence prevention funding is distributed through this county operated infrastructure.

The Department utilizes two contract methods for making grant awards, competitive and non-competitive. All but one of the service areas supported by the Governor's Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program are awarded through a non-competitive contracting process.

Contract Methods

A. Competitive Contract Process

Competitive contracting processes are accomplished through use of either a Request for Proposal (RFP) or a Request for Bid (RFB) process, often authorized under legislative or congressional appropriations. A template is used to assure consistency and compliance with policies, statutes, or rules, although each request for proposals is tailored to fit the unique characteristics of the authorizing funds and the programs to be supported or developed.

B. Non-Competitive Contracting Processes

Funding may be distributed under a non-competitive process under one of the following conditions/mechanisms.

- Competition does not exist as all eligible and/or qualified providers receive an **equitable distribution** of funds. This usually occurs when distributing funds among all County and Tribal governmental entities responsible by state Statute in providing substance abuse prevention services under Wisconsin Act 51. Distribution will frequently be based upon a formula to establish the amount of funds available to each entity. Either an existing formula is used that has been established by the state to determine base funding, or a new formula is established based on unique characteristics that support the funding priorities and/or funding needs.
- Competition does not exist when services are **provided directly** by the administering agency organization such as the Department of Health and Family Services providing direct services as opposed to through the use of subgrantees or subcontractors. Another unit of state government may provide the needed service directly through an Interagency Agreement. These are not considered to be purchases, and are not subject to DOA procurement regulations as the service is being provided directly through the same corporate governmental system that is responsible for administration.

Identifying Needs and Priorities

The Department of Health and Family Services uses a number of mechanisms to establish prevention priorities for youth populations and services. Public input is collected through a variety of channels, evaluation and audit data is collected and analyzed, and statewide youth risk indicator data is also collected through a number of sources to assist in establishing needs and priorities.

Public and Provider Input

The Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services, Division of Children and Family Services regularly solicits information, comments and feedback from Wisconsin's prevention community through a variety of committees, surveys, public events, and meetings. This information is used to develop an effective and responsive service delivery system and to develop the resources needed to support this system. The Department also utilizes newsletters, and Web based technology to inform and invite responses from providers, parents, youth, and citizens. Many of those entities providing this input have representation on a Governor's appointed "state Council on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuses". The State Council on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse is a statutory body appointed by the Governor to provide leadership and coordination regarding alcohol and other drug abuse issues confronting the state. The statute requires the development of a comprehensive state plan for alcohol and other drug abuse programs, and goals for the time period covered by the plan. It also has statutory responsibility to review and make recommendations to the Governor, the Legislature and state agencies regarding the plans, budgets and operations of all state alcohol and other drug abuse programs.

Goals established through the State Council on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse include:

Goal 1:

Inform the citizens of Wisconsin that the statutorily appointed State Council on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse serves as the primary entity responsible for the coordination of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse program planning, policy development, funding and administration.

Goal 2:

To enhance coordination between and within state, county, local, private and tribal agencies with Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse initiatives and responsibilities in order to reduce duplication of programming and replicate knowledge transfer of successful programs.

Goal 3:

To improve accessibility for all state citizens to a comprehensive system of alcohol and other drug abuse services including education, prevention, intervention, treatment, and continuing care that lead to measurable reductions in substance abuse.

Goal 4:

To promote equal and timely access for all Wisconsin citizens to a full range of culturally specific services, especially those who are at high risk and underserved, for example minorities, pregnant women, persons with mental illness and other disabilities, older persons, youth and offenders in the youth or criminal justice systems, to achieve measurable reductions in substance abuse.

Goal 5:

To ensure and promote that AODA services and initiatives throughout the state be cost effective and of the highest quality possible as a result of supporting the establishment of standards, evaluation of programs, and encourage technical assistance and funding for successful programs.

Goal 6:

Provide leadership, advocacy and coordination by addressing alcohol and other drug abuse related problems and issues through long range planning and an awareness of and response to emerging problems and issues.

Goal 7:

To promote a continuum of partnerships among public agencies and private businesses, organizations and citizens in alcohol and other drug abuse planning, policy-making, administration and service delivery.

Goal 8:

To promote competent substance abuse professionals through training and human resource development.

Evaluation and Audit Information

A legislative prevention program audit was completed in 1996 which has been used to create new and lasting changes in the Department's prevention services delivery system and establishing long term priorities for improving program outcomes. The Report stressed the need to consider solutions that would:

- Structure services to foster coordination of local prevention efforts;
- Reduce duplication of services;
- Create funding strategies that encourage the development of local comprehensive prevention initiatives;
- Enhance efforts to evaluate effectiveness;
- Enhance effective information and technical assistance services to support local prevention efforts.

The Department continues to be responsive in developing solutions to the areas noted in this report. Services and programs have been designed to assist communities in establishing comprehensive systems of coordination in serving the needs of youth in the area of prevention and early intervention services. Local youth serving organizations, industry, business and parents are involved in developing methods to collect information regarding community risk and establish strategies to increase protective factors among individuals, families and communities. Multifaceted systems are emerging to address issues beyond substance abuse prevention to include services to reduce violence, teen pregnancy, mental health promotion, prevention of child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, and others.

Youth Risk Behavior Indicator Data

The Department utilizes youth risk indicator data from a number of sources to assist in determining service populations, risk groups, and geographic target areas. Two instruments are primarily used to assist in this effort.

Youth Risk Indicator Report – Data collected biennially by the Department of Public Instruction via adolescent survey instruments administered through Wisconsin school districts. The 2001 Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey report can be viewed at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/sspw/yrbsindx.html>

Statewide County Youth Risk Indicator Report – This report is annually commissioned by the Department of Health and Family Services, through a contract provided to the University of Wisconsin Medical Schools - Center for Health Policy and Program Evaluation. This report reviews youth risk indicator data from each of Wisconsin's 72 counties and compiles this data into a single score used to rank counties from highest to lowest need. See "Needs Assessment Measure used by the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program" for more information ([Appendix B](#)).

Summary of Services

Based upon a review and analysis of ongoing public input, and through the collection of youth indicator data, the Governor's Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program intends to support six service areas as described below. Details regarding each of the six service areas are provided below. A description of the service, including the priorities addressed, criteria for selection and/or granting an award, and a description how the service promotes improved academic achievement.

Summary Table

#	Program or Service Area	Amount Budgeted
1	Training and technical assistance to enhancing effective information and technical assistance services to support local prevention efforts.	\$390,000
2	Youth leadership and development services promoting the healthy engagement of youth within Wisconsin schools and communities	\$200,000
3	Increase the availability and accessibility of appropriate, effective community-based prevention/education services for high risk target populations	\$369,492
4	Safe and Stable Families Substance Abuse Prevention Component	\$256,596
5	Alliance for Wisconsin Youth Partnership Program	\$144,306
6	Evaluation and Program Development Enhancement	\$39,077
SUBTOTAL		1,399,471
7	Administration	\$43,592
TOTAL		\$1,443,063

1. Training and technical assistance to enhancing effective information and technical assistance services to support local prevention efforts.

a.	Timeline	
a.1.	Submission of Application Materials	August 19, 2002
a.2.	Review and Approval of Local Application	September 16, 2002
a.3.	Intend to Award Grant Announced	October 14, 2002
a.4.	Contract Executed	November 11, 2002
a.5.	Program Implementation Dates	January 1, 2003 – December 2003
b.	Selection Criteria	
Noncompetitive Interagency Agreement to the University of Wisconsin’s Clearinghouse for Prevention Resources and Prevention Resource Center. An approved application/proposal is required. This proposal will address the criteria stated in the description provided.		
c.	How Program Promotes Academic Achievement	
This program will foster the effective provision of information and technical assistance to local organizations that provide prevention services to youth thus enhancing the effectiveness of these services aimed at improving healthy outcomes for Wisconsin’s youth.		

Program Description and Justification

This program will provide prevention information and assistance to Wisconsin organizations involved in activities and services aimed at preventing substance abuse among Wisconsin youth. Information will be disseminated through a variety of communication channels and will include, but is not limited to, educational materials concerning effective ATODA prevention and early intervention programs and strategies, program and policy information that enhances the healthy development of Wisconsin's children and families, evaluation results and methods, community organizing strategies, fund raising methods, identifying grant resource information, and human resource and referral sources.

The service provider will also sponsor and/or co-sponsor training events, forums, conferences, symposiums and other programs that will effectively enhance the capacity for communities and provider and educational agencies to develop strategies for assisting in the development of healthy youth and prevention substance abuse and violence. Technical assistance will also be provided to organizations throughout the state to enhance prevention systems planning and development. Information and technical assistance will help community action groups, policy makers and funders to improve prevention systems, programs, and policies through citizen involvement that promotes comprehensive systems planning. This service will enhance the efficiency of local agencies to search for information, or develop technical expertise, independently by providing comprehensive, easily accessible information on grants and other funding sources that are available for prevention, identify appropriate and effective models for prevention that local community service providers and schools can use as a basis for their own programs, and provide assistance to local agencies in evaluating the effectiveness of their programs.

2. Youth leadership and development services promoting the healthy engagement of youth within Wisconsin schools and communities.

a.	Timeline	
a.1.	Submission of Application Materials	August 19, 2002
a.2.	Review and Approval of Local Application	September 16, 2002
a.3.	Intend to Award Grant Announced	October 14, 2002
a.4.	Contract Executed	November 11, 2002
a.5.	Program Implementation Dates	January 1, 2003 – December 2003
b.	Selection Criteria	
	Interagency agreement to the University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, University Extension, School of Arts and Science Outreach. This state organization has over 20 years of experience developing and administering this teen leadership model throughout the state.	
c.	How Program Promotes Academic Achievement	
	This program will provide skill building training to teens, referred by local school districts, to become prevention advocates within their schools and communities. Adults will assist in the development and carrying out of local action plans as well as continue to promote the local involvement and engagement of youth.	

Program Description and Justification

This Teen Institute model will focus on prevention of youth substance abuse with an emphasis on examining values and attitudes, practicing good communication skills, education on alcohol and other drug abuse, and making responsible decisions. This program will facilitate 5 – 7 regional Teen Institutes annually within Wisconsin, inviting youth and adult leaders from school districts throughout the state to participate in teams of 10 or more (8 youth, 2 adults) to participate in a 3-day teen leadership training event aimed at develop teen leaders who are willing and able to help implement alcohol and other drug abuse prevention projects in their schools and communities, and who are committed too making and promoting healthy life style choices.

3. Increase the availability and accessibility of appropriate, effective community-based prevention/education services for high risk target populations.

a.	Timeline	
a.1.	Submission of Application Materials	August 19, 2002
a.2.	Review and Approval of Local Application	September 16, 2002
a.3.	Intend to Award Grant Announced	October 14, 2002
a.4.	Contract Executed	November 11, 2002
a.5.	Program Implementation Dates	January 1, 2003 – December 2003
b.	Selection Criteria	
	A noncompetitive formula grant will be used to fund these programs. Equitable distribution of funds will be made to the only four inner city areas of the state located in the cities of Kenosha, Racine, Beloit and Madison Wisconsin. Funds will also be distributed equitably among each of the 11 Native American Indian Tribes through the Department Tribal Consolidated Family Services Plan (Tribes operate on a Federal Fiscal Year requiring timeline to be adjusted accordingly from the state Calendar Year award process).	
c.	How Program Promotes Academic Achievement	
	Academic achievement promoted through coordinating its services with area school districts aimed at students whose academic achievement is deteriorating and have been identified as being at risk for substance abuse.	

Program Description and Justification

The Department has determined that geographic areas or targeted populations within the state are at higher risk and in need of targeted services. These areas include the five inner-city urban areas of the state located in the cities of Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Madison and Beloit, and within the eleven Indian Tribes of Wisconsin. Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities funds will be used to supplement the current level of services in these communities and tribes (Milwaukee not included as other funds have been identified to serve Milwaukee area students) to serve high risk youth populations.

4. Safe and Stable Families Substance Abuse Prevention Component

a.	Timeline	
a.1.	Submission of Application Materials	August 19, 2002
a.2.	Review and Approval of Local Application	September 16, 2002
a.3.	Intend to Award Grant Announced	October 14, 2002
a.4.	Contract Executed	November 11, 2002
a.5.	Program Implementation Dates	January 1, 2003 – December 2003
b.	Selection Criteria	
	Equitable distribution of funds to each of the state's county and tribal governmental entities responsible for the administration and delivery of services under Title IV-B, Safe and Stable Families Program. Assure that families receiving services through this local project identify the prevention/early intervention needs of children. Funds are used to supplement statewide Family Preservation/Family Support Project and are targeted towards youth and substance abuse prevention services	
c.	How Program Promotes Academic Achievement	
	Academic achievement will be achieved by decreasing the incidence of substance abuse among youth, preventing the unnecessary separation of children from their families, improving the quality of care and services to children and their families, and ensuring permanency for children through reunification with parents, through adoption, or through another permanent living arrangement.	

Program Description and Justification

A large and growing number of children in our state are affected by a range of community factors that increase a young persons risk of academic failure often compromising their ability to become productive, healthy, well-educated adults. Unsafe living conditions, abuse and neglect, family and youth violence, drug and alcohol addiction, deteriorating neighborhoods, inadequate health care, lack of child care, teenage parenthood, poor nutrition, unemployment, all adversely affect family relationship's, communities, and the ability of children to learn and grow. Meeting the needs of children and families affected by these conditions imposes heavy costs on all citizens of the state by requiring costly special services, income assistance, and all to often, incarceration or institutionalization. These costs are a burden on the capacity of the state's economy to produce sufficient revenues and an adequate tax base.

These funds will be used in concert with the Federal Safe and Stable Family Program to demonstrate a comprehensive program that is coordinated with local schools, county social services agencies, law enforcement agencies and other alcohol and other drug abuse community organizations.

The Safe and Stable Family Program was created through the Federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. This legislation provided new Federal funds under Title IV-B, of the Child and Family Services Program of the Social Security Act. These funds are provided to state child welfare agencies for preventive services (family support services) and services to families at risk or in crisis (family preservation services). In addition to providing funds to expand services, the legislation offers states the opportunity to assess and make changes in state and local service delivery in child welfare, broadly defined. states have been encouraged to use these funds as a catalyst for establishing a continuum of coordinated and integrated, culturally relevant, family focused services for families and children.

The legislation requires states to engage in a comprehensive planning process for the development of a meaningful and responsive family support and family preservation strategy. The scope of the planning should go beyond child welfare to include housing, economic support, employment, mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, public health, education, juvenile justice and community-based programs that support children and families. Participants in the planning process include families, businesses, civic organizations, service providers and funding organizations.

Wisconsin will use Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act funds to supplement dollars under the Safe and Stable Family Program to assist all 72 counties and 11 tribes to engage in a comprehensive community planning process. Contingent on the availability of Federal funds, counties and tribes will become eligible for ongoing service grants. Service grants will be based on the needs of the community as presented and documented in their plan.

In addition to supporting and participating in local planning efforts, the Department of Health and Family Services will be working extensively with other state agencies, providers, advocates and local communities to assess barriers to comprehensive services, identify additional funds to support this initiative, collaborate with other community development and service integration efforts, redesign the delivery of services to children and families, and evaluate state and local efforts.

5. Alliance for Wisconsin Youth Partnership Program

a.	Timeline	
a.1.	Release Request for Proposals	July 7, 2002
a.2.	Deadline for Submission of Proposals	September 16, 2002
a.3.	Peer Review and Award Recommendations	October 11, 2002
a.4.	Notice of Intent to Award Issues	October 18, 2002
a.5.	Contract Executed	November 11, 2002
a.6.	Program Implementation Dates	January 1, 2003 – December 2003
b.	Selection Criteria	
Competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) among the approximately 100 community coalitions organized under the Alliance for Wisconsin Youth. Also see description above.		
c.	How Program Promotes Academic Achievement	
Academic achievement will be improved through community implementation of the “Five America’s Promises” that include: 1. Caring Adults (Ongoing relationships with parents, mentors, tutors, and coaches.) 2. Safe Places (Structured activities during non-school hours.) 3. A Healthy Start (Accessible health care, nutrition education, and exercise.) 4. Marketable Skills (Effective education, basic skills training, and internships.) 5. Opportunities to Serve (Youth volunteerism and community service.)		

Program Description and Justification

A program of the Governor's Office, the Alliance for Wisconsin Youth is housed in the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services. The goal of the Alliance for Wisconsin Youth is to work in collaboration with our network of roughly 100 community coalitions to ensure that all of our state's young people grow up in truly positive and nurturing environments. We do this by fulfilling the Five Promises of America's Promise. Each of the Promises identifies an element crucial for positive youth development.

The purpose of the Alliance for Wisconsin Youth's Promise Fund is to provide funds for Local Alliances working to fulfill one or more of the Five Promises to Wisconsin Youth. Promise Fund grants and awards are given to implement effective and innovative results-oriented projects.

The following criteria will be used in the selection of grant recipients. All grant proposals must be submitted by a representative of a local Alliance that has received such designation by the Department of Health and Family Services, Alliance for Wisconsin Youth, and is in good standing in meeting all criteria established to become an Alliance member.

All applicants must also develop a proposal addressing the following areas:

Project Description

Describes the project being proposed. What community problem or need are being addressed, and how the proposed project address this problem or need? Describes the strategies used and why, citing research if appropriate. Describes why they feel the project is innovative or creative. Describes the process used to reach out to youth in high-risk groups.

Project Workplan

A detailed workplan must be produced including all major tasks and timelines. Describes what youth-serving organizations will be involved? Identify who will be responsible for each major task.

Project Results

Describes the specific results expected. For each specific result, a description will be provided indicating how many youth are expected served. Describes expected results in terms of the "Five Promises" (of America's Promise). Describes how results are objectively measurable?

Project Budget

Provides a detailed project budget including all anticipated expenses. Separate grant costs from others costs that may be supplementing the cost of the program. Costs will be calculated for each of the five expense categories: staff salaries, contractual services, travel and transportation, equipment and supplies, and other costs? Provide a budget justification for each of the five expense categories.

6. Evaluation and Program Development Enhancement

a.	Timeline	
a.1.	Submission of Application Materials	August 19, 2002
a.2.	Review and Approval of Local Application	September 16, 2002
a.3.	Intend to Award Grant Announced	October 14, 2002
a.4.	Contract Executed	November 11, 2002
a.5.	Program Implementation Dates	January 1, 2003 – December 2003
b.	Selection Criteria	
	Purchase of service contracts to sundry vendors to improve the coordination, delivery or evaluation of substance abuse prevention programs in Wisconsin.	
c.	How Program Promotes Academic Achievement	
	This program category will help to enhance the overall effectiveness of substance abuse prevention services in Wisconsin resulting in improved outcomes of Wisconsin students.	

Program Description and Justification

Funds will support the design, enhancement, and or implementation of evaluation models that will be used to collect local youth and family data and information that will assist the Department, subgrantees, local communities (including local educational agencies) to determine service priorities, achievement of program outcomes, and help to identify high risk geographic areas of the state that may require special attention or more intensive preventative interventions due to an increase in youth risk behavior indicators. These efforts will support youth development efforts defined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services/Administration on Children, Youth and Families as:

Youth Development is defined as a program or service that is implemented in order for young people to achieve their full potential to prevent them from becoming involved in risky behavior. Youth development strategies focus on giving young people the opportunity to build skills, exercise leadership, form relationships with caring adults, and help their communities. Further, the youth development approach acknowledges that youth are resources in rebuilding communities and that helping young people requires strengthening families and communities.

Funds will also be used to support special one-time purchases or activities designed to promote or enhance the integration of youth development/engagement methods into existing programs and services. Funds will be distributed on a special request basis not to exceed \$20,000 per expenditure. All purchases will comply with purchasing guidelines and policies established by the State Department of Administration and approved by the Federal Government.

Professional development and technical assistance to schools and other subgrantees

WDPI staff and its contractors will provide a wide variety of professional development and technical assistance to grantees to help implement drug and violence programs consistent with the Principles of Effectiveness.

- WDPI staff will provide grant workshops on a regional basis to help prepare for EOY reporting requirements, new application development, to incorporate best practices, and to understand current and emerging drug and violence issues.
- Regional education service agencies, CESAs, under contract with the DPI, will provide ongoing information, technical assistance and professional development to support SDFS programs based on local needs.
- WDPI grantees will be invited to a statewide conference which includes a specific technical assistance meeting for grantees regarding program administration and priorities. The conference will provide models for best practices in drug and violence prevention along with current research and evaluation findings.
- Four WDPI grant managers will provide individual consultation to local SDFS coordinators on all aspects for program development and evaluation.
- WDPI consultants in school counseling, social work, nursing, psychology and health education will provide individual consultation to school and community staff implementing SDFS related to drug and violence prevention.
- WDPI legal services staff will provide information and interpretations of case law and Attorney General opinions on a wide variety of SDFS issues including: drug testing, searches, student discipline and prevention and intervention program implementation, confidentiality, and related concerns.
- WDPI will sponsor regional workshops on a wide variety of SDFS issues including, but not limited to: bullying and harassment, effective classroom instruction on drug and violence prevention, assessment of student knowledge and skills regarding drug and violence prevention, classroom management, and crisis response.
- The WDPI web pages will provide technical and program information related to SDFS and appropriate issues.
- The WDPI will work with the American Lung Association of Wisconsin to promote effective school policies regarding tobacco use.
- The WDPI will co-sponsor a variety of conference and workshops addressing drug and violence prevention with other state agencies and organizations. Examples include the Adolescence and Families Conference, the Forum on Youth Violence, Wisconsin School Counselors Association Conference, Wisconsin School Social Workers Association Conference, the Wisconsin School Nurses Association Conference, and the Wisconsin School Psychologists Conference
- The WDPI will provide ongoing current information on trends through a surveillance system that includes the Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey and the Wisconsin School Health Education Profile.
- WDHFS will provide the Youth Tobacco Survey results to further measure adolescent tobacco use.

Monitoring

DPI consultants will conduct initial review of program proposals and note in writing any deficiencies and /or clarifications needed. Results of this review including recommendations or requirements for improvement will be provided to LEAs within 120 days of receipt.

Fiscal claims for reimbursement will be reviewed by DPI with respect to the approved budget and for accordance with ESEA fiscal regulations. This review will be completed within 2 weeks of receipt.

End of Year Progress and Performance report. DPI will gather, analyze and compile data from each participating LEA which includes:

- progress towards measurable objectives and performance measure;
- school crime and weapon incidence, and;
- descriptions of all activities and segments of the population.

8. Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, Section 4126)

Introduction

The purpose of the Community Service Grant Program is to support programs under which students expelled or suspended from school are required to perform community service. Pending additional federal guidance on this new ESEA program and after consultation with the Governor, WDPI proposes to provide a program to the highest need LEAs for this purpose. LEAs would be encouraged to partner with community-based organizations to create or expand such programs to help all students achieve high standards

a. Program Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

Applicants will be required to adhere to the following characteristics:

- The proposed activities are consistent with the principles of effectiveness described in section 4115(a).
- The proposed activities are consistent with the purpose of the act, to close the achievement gap.
- The proposed activities create or expand community service opportunities to suspended and/or expelled students.

These criteria will help assure that programs improve academic achievement through the development of programs based on objective needs, appropriate performance measures, research-based strategies, effective evaluation, and parent involvement. Community service opportunities for suspended and expelled students can be expected to result in improved commitment to education and to the community, which in turn will help enhance achievement.

b. Expectations and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

WDPI will expect grantees to exhibit the following characteristics:

- Cost-effectiveness, describing costs for services and numbers of students to be served.
- Accountability, describing appropriate performance measures and the methods to measure these.
- Collaboration between the school and broader community.
- Activities describing how such activities will be sustained beyond the grant period.

These expectations will help assure that programs help a large number of students, involve community-school collaboration and can be sustained, thus increasing the likelihood of benefits beyond the grant period. These in turn will help greater numbers of students improve in academic achievement.

9. 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)

Introduction

The purpose of the Community Learning Center (CLC) program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that—(1) provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet state and local student academic achievement standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and mathematics; (2) offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, art, music, and recreation programs, technology education programs, and character education programs, that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and (3) offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

The WDPI will provide broad dissemination of this grant opportunity to all eligible partners. In addition, applicants must describe how they will overcome barriers to equitable participation by all targeted students including appropriate methods of outreach.

a. Timelines

21st Century Community Learning Centers	
Dates for 2002	Activity
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop draft state plan. ▪ Consult with key stakeholders, representatives of required groups and agencies.
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publish application guidance, application form. ▪ Conduct ESEA workshops to provide general guidance.
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct web/teleconferences for grant writers. ▪ Provide consultation to applicants.
June 30	▪ Applications due to WDPI.
July	▪ Conduct external expert review panel.
August	▪ Conduct internal review.
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Award grants. ▪ Provide technical assistance (ongoing).
October	▪ Conduct statewide meeting for grantees.

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

Selection criteria include poverty level of the targeted population, completeness of an appropriate local plan and assurances, geographical distribution of grant awards, and collaboration between school and community agencies. The local application process will ensure that the funded CLCs target the appropriate priorities and meet other requirements in the NCLB. The local application will include a list of assurances; a description of the program, goals and objectives; an evaluation process; a sustainability plan; and a work plan to meet the priorities of the legislation. The following will be the key criteria for grant awards.

- High poverty. All CLC grant awards will be made to applicants that will primarily serve students and families from schools with poverty of 40 percent or greater.
- Quality of the proposal and plan. This will include the quality of the needs assessment, and program plan, including the breadth of appropriate services, collaboration, and evaluation.
- Geographical distribution is an additional criterion. In accordance with ESEA regulations, WDPI will select applicants in order to distribute funds across the state in both rural and urban communities.
- Presence of collaboration between schools, community-based organizations and other public and private entities. Whenever possible schools and community-based organizations are encouraged to collaborate to implement CLCs targeting students and their families.

Together these factors will help assure that the students with greatest need and in various parts of the state are serviced with effective services that aim to improve academic achievement. Minimum awards will be \$50,000.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

Two factors will be considered as high priorities for awards:

- A first priority for CLC awards will be to serve students from schools that have been identified for improvement based on the statewide accountability system under NCLB. Much greater weight will be given to proposals to serve schools identified for improvement for 2001.
- A second priority will be given to proposals that serve schools with higher poverty levels. While at least 40 percent poverty, as measured by the proportion of students eligible for free and reduced lunch, is a requirement for award eligibility, additional priority will be given to proposals that serve schools with higher poverty levels.

These priorities will promote improved academic through targeting schools whose students have greatest needs for improved academic achievement and schools whose students have greatest need in terms of poverty.

The WDPI is designated as the official state agency to administer and supervise programs under Title IV, Part B. Ninety-five percent of Wisconsin's distribution will be awarded to local eligible applicants. WDPI will retain 5 percent for appropriate activities as stated in Section 4202 (C).

Training and Technical Assistance

Comprehensive training and technical assistance will be provided for all grantees. DPI will work with a number of organizations to ensure support and capacity building activities that will assist school communities in developing, operating, and sustaining high quality Community Learning Center programs.

DPI will collaborate with the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the National Center for Community Education (NCCE), the Wisconsin Community Education Association (WCEA) and others to provide training. Each grantee will be expected to set-aside \$2000 to support staff training. Each grantee will be expected to send a team of three members to a fall and spring training session in conjunction with the Mott Foundation and NCCE. The training model will be similar to the current structure supported by the Mott Foundation.

A training for Wisconsin project directors on best practices in starting a community learning center will be held on October 2 in Green Bay in conjunction with the WCEA's annual fall conference. The WCEA conference will provide addition training has also scheduled multiple sessions related to CLC programs both from a policy and programming perspective.

WDPI is represented on the Mott Foundation/NCCE regional training committee chaired by Bridget Gothberg - NCCE staff member. Wisconsin has the capacity to provide high quality training exemplified by the partnership developed to implement a two day training held in Stevens Point WI in April 2002.

WDPI will host a fall and spring web based teleconference for all grantees to assist in implementation and evaluation activities

WDPI will provide resources and offer technical assistance to help grantees learn about and utilize available research that is relevant and supports after school programs. WDPI will promote and provide other training on relevant research-based areas including academic programs, classroom management, and others topics.

WDPI will provide information for CLC grantees via telephone consultation, educational materials, an email listserv and the world wide web.

Monitoring and Evaluation

WDPI will conduct an after school needs and resource assessment or collect existing information to provide support and documentation for a plan to provide professional development and technical assistance for grant recipients and other eligible entities. This may include the results of the Wisconsin survey of after school programs collected by the National Governor's Association (NGA).

1. WDPI will have a system in place to collect data and to monitor subgrantee activity. This will include the following. WDPI consultants will conduct initial review of program proposals and note in writing any deficiencies and /or clarifications needed. Results of this review including recommendations or requirements for improvement will be provided to grantees within 120 days of receipt.
2. Fiscal claims for reimbursement will be reviewed by WDPI with respect to the approved budget and for accordance with ESEA fiscal regulations. This review will be completed within 2 weeks of receipt.

3. End of Year Progress and Performance Report. WDPI will systematically gather, analyze and compile consistent data from each participating CLC. This will be based on part on the US Department of Education's Annual Performance Report for Community Learning Center grantees. Data will include:

- Indicators of academic performance in core academic subjects (reading, language arts, mathematics, science, social studies) among students regularly participating in the Community Learning Center;
- Indicators of behavior including attendance and disciplinary problems among students regularly participating;
- progress towards measurable objectives and performance measures;
- number and types of students participating, number of hours and types of services provided to students and families;
- challenges, how they will address problems and lack of progress, if this does occur;
- how they promote the Center to the community and targeted students.

WDPI intends to contract with a University of Wisconsin unit to conduct the needs assessment and the subgrantee evaluation.

3. *In the **June 2002 submission**, describe how the state will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the state's (and those entities' own) performance goals and objectives. This description should include the assistance the SEA will provide to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees in identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research.*

The WDPI has a long history of providing excellent monitoring, technical assistance, and professional development to subgrantees of state and federal competitive grant programs.

The monitoring, technical assistance, and professional development for ESEA programs will start with the application process. Each of the competitive grant programs will include an extensive application and peer review process. During the application process prospective recipients will have access to grant workshops, grant guidance materials, and technical assistance from program experts at the WDPI and/or CESA.

During the application and review process, each application will undergo an external and internal review process with specific benchmarks developed by the WDPI for assessment by internal and external readers. Upon selection, each subgrantee will be assigned a program manager who has expertise in the specific program area providing the funding. In addition to the initial plan within the application, each subgrantee will be required to submit mid-year and end-of-the year reports detailing progress made toward reaching program goals.

WDPI program managers and accountants will complete a fiscal review of expenditures. All subgrantees will have access to a program manager throughout the grant duration. Selected on-site visits for program compliance will be conducted when discrepancies on program expenditures or failure to meet program goals are determined.

The NWP and the requirements and goals of the ESEA will provide the framework for providing technical assistance and on-site reviews to grantees. In addition, all staff development activities will link to redefined standards for teachers, pupil services staff, and administrators. Staff and system self-assessment instruments will be available in the WINSS Internet resource system. The school self-assessment will provide school improvement teams, parents, and community members the opportunity to rate the school system according to the Characteristics of Successful Schools (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/sit/cssovrvw1.html>) The self-assessment is comprised of eight perception surveys of 20-35 items each—one per characteristic.

The supporting database will compile survey results and disaggregate perceptions according to role, gender, and race ethnicity. These perceptions will help school improvement teams prioritize areas for improvement in the school system.

The staff surveys—one each for teachers, administrators, and pupil services staff—will give school staff the opportunity to self-assess or gather feedback from others related to their performance based on the standards set in Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin Administrative Code (can be found at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>).

Technical assistance and professional development will include specific guidance on effective strategies and practices based on scientific research and will be available for each program in the following four areas:

1) Consultation via phone E-mail and mail

2) Information resources

Printed publications, Internet resources and multi-media resources (CD-ROM, Video) will be developed within each ESEA program. These resources will include best practices guidelines, question and answer documents, and information bulletins. Many of these and a wide variety of school data sets are already integrated into the WINSS online system.

3) Program specific training and professional development

Yearly planned statewide conferences, grantee regional workshops, and trainings will be conducted on issues related to the programs funded under ESEA. These will be developed and conducted in partnership with CESAs, local education agencies, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and other state agencies. A special emphasis of all professional development activities will be strategies for each program to meet state and local performance goals, indicators, and yearly targets.

4) Onsite technical assistance

Selected on-site consultation and technical assistance will be available for subgrantees whose needs require additional help.

4. *In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the statewide system of support under section 1117 for ensuring that all schools meet the state's academic content and student achievement standards, including how the state will provide assistance to low-performing schools.*

The WDPI, using the framework for successful schools articulated through the WINSS, will develop a school support system. The system will use resources from NCREL, Comprehensive Assistance Center VI and others knowledgeable about scientifically-based research and practice on teaching and

learning about successful Title I schoolwide projects, reform, and improving educational opportunities for low-achieving students. The support system will include:

- Establishing and providing assistance to school support teams to help schools and districts in need of improvement.
- Designating and using distinguished teachers and principals to provide support to schools in need of improvement.
- Using other approaches and entities such as higher education institutions, consortia of LEAs organized by CESAs, and private technical assistance providers.

The WDPI through WINSS will ensure that all districts and schools have information regarding the Wisconsin academic content and student achievement standards and how to demonstrate meeting of these standards. The WINSS website will include:

- Descriptions of activities to acquaint school staff, families, and other community members with the Wisconsin model academic standards and how the standards are evaluated.
- Links to scientifically-based research and best practices to help children achieve high standards.
- Resources for effective, research-based professional development and technical assistance.
- Data about student performance on state assessments.
- An interactive school improvement planning tool that helps school improvement teams examine student achievement data, school system data, and staff performance data to determine priorities for improvement. The tool will also generate a school improvement plan that includes goals, tasks, timelines, resources, and persons responsible. This plan will be stored and updated by the school improvement team and accessed electronically by WDPI.

The WDPI will identify the academically neediest schools and districts and set priorities for services. The activities described in this section that have costs associated with them will be conducted with the approval of the targeted LEAs.

- **Priority 1 Schools/Districts.** These are schools/districts that have failed to meet AYP for four or more consecutive years.

WDPI will provide the following support to Priority 1 schools/districts:

- Provide intensive and sustained services through school support teams, distinguished educators and others in research centers, colleges, or private agencies providing services. School support teams will include persons knowledgeable about scientifically-based research and practices on teaching and learning and about successful schoolwide projects, school reform, and improving educational opportunities for low-achieving students. School support teams assigned to a school will do the following:
 - ▶ Review and analyze all facets of the school's operations.
 - ▶ Assist staff and others in developing recommendations for improving student performance.
 - ▶ Collaborate with parents and school and district staff in the design, implementation and monitoring of a plan for improvement.

- ▶ Evaluate, as least semiannually, effectiveness of school improvement efforts and, if appropriate, school personnel. Make findings and recommendations to the school, district, and where appropriate, the WDPI (unless otherwise precluded through local labor agreements).
- ▶ Make additional recommendations regarding school improvement implementation concerning additional assistance needed by the school.
- Provide data analysis retreats for each school/district including a framework for the required school improvement plan.
- Provide or help select professional development as indicated by the results of the comprehensive needs assessment.
- Give preference to schools in awarding Title I, Part F Comprehensive School Reform (CSRSD) funds, Reading First grants, and Community Learning Center grants.
- Assist the school in identifying and writing grants for other funding that would support improvement efforts.
- For low-performing schools that qualify, provide information on the advantages of Title I Schoolwide programs and assist in the planning process for school improvement.
- Offer an AmeriCorps member of VISTA through the WDPI's literacy/partnership grant from the Corporation for National Service.

WDPI will provide the following intensive support for seven to ten schools:

- Onsite school improvement facilitators for up to three years to focus on school improvement efforts and build capacity of school staff to take over leadership of continued school improvement efforts.
- Other support, including personnel, when the need is indicated by the comprehensive school improvement plan.
- Collaboration with the schools/districts to provide coordination and evaluation of the intensive support processes.

■ **Priority 2 Schools/Districts.** These are schools designated as in need of improvement after two consecutive years of failure to meet AYP. The WDPI will do all of the following:

- Provide data analysis retreats for each school/district that includes a framework for a comprehensive needs assessment.
- Provide detailed information on available resources and research-based strategies for school improvement.
- Provide or recommend professional development focused on identified needs.
- For low-performing schools that qualify, provide information on the advantages of Title I Schoolwide programs and assist in the planning process.
- Help schools use the school improvement planning tool on WINSS that guides them through a data analysis and goal setting process.

- Provide information on available grants and access to grant writing workshops.
- Offer an AmeriCorps member of VISTA through the WDPI's literacy/partnership grant from the Corporation for National Service.

■ **Priority 3 Schools/Districts.** These are districts and schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that need support and assistance in order to meet student achievement requirements and avoid school “in need of improvement” designation. It includes those schools/districts not meeting AYP for one year who request assistance from the department. The WDPI will do all of the following:

- Provide information on available resources and research-based strategies for school improvement.
- For low-performing schools that qualify, provide information on the advantages of Title I Schoolwide programs and assist in the planning process.
- Provide access to data analysis retreats for each school/district that includes a framework for a comprehensive needs assessment.
- Help schools use the school improvement planning tool on WINSS that guides them through a data analysis and goal setting process.
- Provide information on available grants and access to grant writing workshops.
- Offer an AmeriCorps member of VISTA through the WDPI's literacy/partnership grant from the Corporation for National Service.

The WDPI will develop model processes and identify effective tools to scale up for use in other low-performing schools in Wisconsin. Based on the results of the selected intensive assistance described above under Priority 1 schools/districts, the network of personnel that were successful in effecting improved academic achievement will assist in expanding services to other schools and/or districts.

School Improvement Grants—The WDPI will allocate 95 percent of these grants to LEAs with schools in need of improvement of the 2 percent reserve from Title I, Part A, subpart 2. This includes corrective action and restructuring status. WDPI will give priority to LEAs that serve the lowest-achieving schools, demonstrate the greatest need, and demonstrate the strongest commitment to use the funds to meet the progress goals developed in their school improvement plans.

WDPI will award grants of \$50,000 to \$500,000 to schools identified for improvement with the lowest achievement in the greatest number of content areas, with the highest numbers of students enrolled for a full academic year, and with the greatest need determined by their poverty status. The schools must also be willing to integrate these funds with other ESEA funds awarded by the state. In order to continue to receive funds for the second and third year, the schools must be making progress towards their school improvement goals and must have a plan for sustained improvement after this funding has expired.

WDPI may, with funding approval from the LEAs, directly provide services to them, or arrange for their provision through other entities such as school support teams or CESAs.

5. *In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the activities the state will conduct to –*

- a. *Help Title I schools make effective use of schoolwide programs to improve the achievement of all students, including specific steps the SEA is taking and will take to modify or eliminate state*

fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate federal, state, and local funds for schoolwide programs.

WDPI will design and implement the use of tools that will enable schools to operate more effective schoolwide programs (SWPs). These will include:

- Using the school improvement planning tool on WINSS that guides schools through a data analysis and goal setting process.
- Developing guidelines for operating SWPs.
- Reporting templates that include information on:
 - Comprehensive needs assessments.
 - Academic achievement goals and objectives.
 - Evaluation of yearly progress toward meeting academic goals and objectives.
 - Meeting the needs of all children.
 - Assurance that SWPs address the intent and purposes of each federal program that supports them.
 - Effective participation of families and community in the academic achievement of children.
 - Implementation and evaluation of research-proven strategies.
 - Implementation of the requirements for highly qualified staff.

WDPI will provide statewide SWP conferences that focus on:

- Research into systemic school reform.
- Sharing stories of success.
- Presentations and workshops by experts in the area of schoolwide and school improvement.

WDPI will provide regional workshops that all Title I coordinators (district and Cooperative Educational Service Agencies) and SWP planning teams from schools with SWPs, or eligible to become SWPs, will be expected to attend. Activities will include:

- Assistance to schools in writing or revising their SWP plans.
- Discussion regarding the need to focus on student achievement outcomes.
- Discussion on the importance of including all 10 SWP components identified in Section 1114 of NCLB.
- Assistance with planning for the comprehensive needs assessment process.
- Dissemination of the latest information on research-proven strategies.
- Assistance to SWPs in forming school support teams.
- Analysis of academic and non-academic data to informed decision making.

WDPI will monitor all SWPs in order to:

- Determine compliance with SWP requirements.
- Provide assistance in problem solving.
- Review student achievement outcomes.
- Commend achievement gains and offer suggestions and technical assistance where achievement gains are lacking.
- Identify exemplary programs to be shared with other schools.

The Wisconsin Elementary and Secondary School Accounting System (WESSAS) requires all schools to comply with annual reporting of all district expenditures. This system must be used as long as the federal requirement for separate cash draws from each title grant is in place. Title I Schoolwide schools are free to consolidate all federal funds, including IDEA, to improve the quality of the entire school. Schoolwide programs are not required to maintain separate fiscal accounting records when they combine federal education funds with state and local funds. Flexibility will be maintained in how a school district or school uses Title I resources.

- b. *Ensure that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified. This description should include the help the state's will provide to LEAs and schools t—*
- i. *Conduct effective professional development activities;*
 - ii. *Recruit and hire highly qualified teachers, including those licensed or certified through alternative routes; and*
 - iii. *Retain highly qualified teachers.*

The state will respond to the performance indicators under *Performance Goal #4*: By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers in part through implementation of Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin Administrative Code, relating to the preparation and continued licensure of teachers. Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin Administrative Code (can be found at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>), outlines how Wisconsin will guarantee highly qualified professional teachers. Wisconsin changed its teacher education program approval approach to a performance-based method. Wisconsin will implement tests for teachers beginning in 2004.

Teacher preparation programs will be standards-based and performance driven, as will be the professional development that will be required following licensure. Wisconsin designed and is piloting a model professional development plan that is linked to the new state standards for teachers.

To receive a license to teach in Wisconsin, an applicant shall complete an approved program and demonstrate proficient performance in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions under all of section PI 34.02 teacher standards. (Chapter PI 34 can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>. Section PI 34.02 can be found on p. 176-1).

All WDPI-supported professional education programs and professional development offerings will be based on the above teacher standards, ensuring high quality professional development.

Wisconsin will reduce the number of emergency licenses granted. Alternative preparation programs will be designed to move candidates to full licensure while maintaining the same high standards that exist for traditional preparation programs. Performance targets in this area will be set in 2003 to ensure all teachers are fully licensed and therefore highly qualified by 2005-06.

Districts that are defined as high poverty and schools that are identified as in need of improvement will be encouraged to use Title II funds to plan professional development around the standards and to monitor teachers' successful completion of the professional development activities. Additionally, teacher progress will be compared to student performance gains to assure that the professional development has made a difference for both students and teachers.

The WDPI will provide workshops on the use of the new professional development plan framework as well as orientation to mentoring new staff to ensure highly qualified staff. Additionally, the state will continue to monitor requests for emergency licenses and target schools and districts where teachers are teaching out-of-field or with emergency credentials. Plans will be designed to eliminate emergency credentials by 2005-06.

WDPI is developing three assessment tools for teachers, administrators, and pupil services personnel for the WINSS website. These tools will allow individual staff to self-assess the degree to which they are meeting Chapter PI 34 standards (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>). A supporting database will allow tallying of the results of the assessments and determine common professional development needs of staff in the school.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction will provide mentor training for experienced teachers who will volunteer as mentors for inexperienced teachers in order to help retain highly qualified teachers. A work team appointed by the state superintendent has drafted a work book, Handbook for Designing and Implementing a District-Level Initial Educator Support System, for school districts to structure an effective induction program to help with retention of highly qualified teachers (<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/t2qeg.html>). A different work team appointed by the state superintendent has recommended the creation of a recruitment web site that would be linked to the DPI WINSS site, to alternative routes sites like Troops to Teachers and to the licensing data base. The DPI is planning to use state level funds to create and fill a position to deal exclusively with recruitment of highly qualified educators by coordinating Future Educators of America clubs in middle and high schools as well as working with alternative route providers to encourage career changers to enter the teaching profession as a highly qualified educator. The DPI will continue to work with the Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs to recruit and retain qualified educators through the Troops to Teachers partnership that already exists in the state.

- c. *Ensure that all paraprofessionals (excluding those working with parents or as translators) attain the qualifications stated in sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-2006 school year.*

The department will communicate the requirements in s. 1119 (c) and (d) to all districts through application materials for ESEA funding. Districts will be required to do an analysis of the status of the paraprofessionals working in targeted Title I programs and in School-wide programs. Districts will be required to establish targets for bringing paraprofessionals who do not meet the threshold standard into compliance with the law.

The department will provide a list of acceptable post secondary institutions for the training required. In addition, the department will work with the teacher associations and other co-collaborators who represent major stakeholders, such as the school board association and the principals association, to design an assessment system to determine the ability of the

paraprofessionals to meet the federal standard. This will be a performance based assessment that will include an analysis of competence in the activities listed as appropriate duties, and will include a measure of student learning improvement as a criterion.

The department may also work with a testing company to design and validate a paper and pencil assessment that can be given state wide for examination of the ability of paraprofessional candidates prior to hiring. The department is considering establishing a license category for paraprofessionals that would reflect the standards in the federal law and ensure compliance for all districts.

- d. *Help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public for-profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.*

The WDPI will:

- Provide resources and workshops, as well as telephone and E-mail support, for the development of long-range technology plans.
- Provide support for data collection projects based on data collection requirements in the NCLB.
- Provide support for regional meetings conducted by CESAs for LEAs with a high need for technology.
- Conduct regional meetings for technical assistance on technology plan development, application development, and grant proposal writing.
- Provide personal contact, through surface mail, E-mail, and telephone with the subgrant program consultant.
- Make presentations at conferences and meetings held by others throughout the state.
- Plan and conduct an annual year-end conference for sharing the success of previously funded projects, announcing awards for the next fiscal year, and providing technical assistance for improvement to unsuccessful applicants.
- Assist LEAs in developing partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public for-profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise through collaborative meetings and conferences which bring these entities together.
- Provides assistance for procurement through the Department of Administration.

- e. *Promote parental and community participation in schools.*

The WDPI will do many things to promote parental and community participation in the schools, including:

- Hold regional meetings open to parents and community members as well as LEA staff to provide information about the NCLB and information and technical assistance with the “consolidated plan.”

- Convene the state Superintendent's Parent Leadership Corps to seek out best practices for family-school-community partnerships.
- Write and disseminate materials for LEAs and schools to use with parents and the community to promote school-community partnerships. One example is the 60 page booklet, *The Action Team*, written and compiled by the WDPI family school community partnership coordinator, in conjunction with other agency staff and local practitioners. The publication provides a road map to creating and maintaining effective partnerships. This is one of many "Learning Together" packets that the department has produced to support the meaningful partnerships of parents and communities with the schools.
- Use research-based materials and the resources of the National Network of Partnership Schools to promote partnerships. WDPI will use the research of Joyce Epstein at Johns Hopkins that identifies a framework of six major types of parent and community participation with schools: parenting, communicating, learning at home, volunteering, decision making, and community collaboration.
- Encourage integration of activities at the local level across covered programs that bring together parents and community members with school staff so that children will meet the state's content and performance standards.
- Plan and conduct a 2002 statewide collaborative conference entitled *Strengthening Family-School-Community Partnerships: A Proven Strategy for Increasing Student Learning*. The conference will be a cross-agency effort with Title I, Special Education, Bright Beginnings, and Student Services/Prevention and Wellness (including Title IV). The conference will be co-sponsored by Parents Plus, the state group that has the Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC) grant from USDE; Wisconsin Family Assistance Center for Education (FACETS), a training and support organization; and the Wisconsin PTA.
- Continue the 22 Even Start Family Literacy programs in the state, which will work very closely with school districts and communities in partnership to help students reach high standards, help build school readiness in young children, help parents learn, and to be involved in breaking the cycle of poverty and low literacy.
- Implement a grant that provides over 20 AmeriCorps and VISTA volunteers around the state to work with high poverty schools to improve literacy through partnerships. The WDPI provides orientation, training, and professional development for the volunteers, and helps them form a network of support with one another.
- Coordinate resources in the WDPI to administer and support 21st Century Community Learning Centers as a new state grant program. WDPI will facilitate existing CLC to be involved with newly funded programs to help involve parents. Parental involvement will be a priority of the state CLC program.
- Work with the 37 family resource centers under the Children's Trust Fund to partner with Even Start, VISTA and AmeriCorps sites to provide parent education and support to local communities.
- Continue to implement a service learning program funded by the Corporation for National Service. The program involves students in projects in their schools and in communities.
- Help migratory students achieve through the Title I Migrant Education program while getting parents and families involved in their schools and communities.

- Continue work with the LEAs who have community education programs to help them network and access resources to involve families and communities in learning and recreation.
- Implement the SAGE program, a state funded program that provides resources to schools that include, but are not limited to smaller class sizes, parental and community involvement, and “lighted schoolhouses” so that extended day activities can take place. The overall purpose is to raise and support student achievement.

The Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnerships Team within the WDPI provides leadership for family-school-community partnerships. The team works collaboratively with other teams in the SEA, including Title I, special education, and student services and prevention and wellness to provide technical assistance directly to LEAs as well as through publications and conferences. The BB/FSCP works with the Wisconsin PTA, Wisconsin Community Education Association, and Parents Plus of Wisconsin, the USDE-funded parent information and resource center, to maximize efforts. The WDPI has a history of promoting partnerships, and this past year, received a leadership award from the National Network of Partnership Schools at Johns Hopkins University.

Technical Assistance

The WDPI has provided or will provide technical assistance to schools to assure that schools develop with parents the school-parent compact; that the school choice and supplemental services provisions of NCLB are carried out; and that individual and school report card provisions are implemented.

School-Parent Compacts

Knowing that the best compacts are those developed locally with the input of parents, the WDPI will hold workshop sessions at conferences on writing and revising compacts. It will also share examples of processes of developing compacts as well as sample compacts. The WDPI publishes Learning Together packets twice a year on family-school-community partnerships. In previous packets, it has included information on and samples of compacts. During the next school year, it will develop a packet on partnership connections with NCLB. Further, it will include sample compacts and links to samples on its web site.

School Choice and Supplemental Education Services

The director of the Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnership (BB/FSCP) team chairs the WDPI work group on supplemental services and school choice. The group has drafted a bulletin on parental options and developed a request for proposal for vendors to use. The group will develop a sample contract to be used by the parents, schools, and vendors. Information on these topics will be on the WDPI’s web site and sent to all school districts, the media, and to the State PTA to disseminate to its members. The WDPI has already sought the advice of its Title I Committee of Practitioners on implementing school choice and supplemental services provisions. It will also work with the State Superintendent’s Parent Leadership Corps to seek help in implementing the provisions.

Individual and School Report Cards

Parents have told WDPI through its parent forums and parent advisory committees that they want to know what their children are learning in school and what they need to know to succeed in life. They want to know the connection between state academic standards and assessments and the connection between the standards and what is taught in the classroom.

Knowing that the best information is that which comes to the parents from the teachers and principals, the WDPI developed a template brochure and process for schools to provide information to parents. The WDPI has developed a general brochure on standards and assessment that schools have disseminated to parents. You may view the brochure at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dltcl/bbfensp/pdf/testing.pdf>. The WDPI's Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) includes information on all public schools and links for parents. The WINSS web site can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html>. Parents had an early opportunity to provide input to WINSS, and their input is regularly sought, including this past May, parents and others at a state-sponsoring conference on Strengthening Family-School-Community Partnerships completed a survey that will lead to improved reporting of information to parents as well as to better processes for participation in the schools.

The state superintendent places a high priority on parent and community engagement and will continue to seek their input as well as developing sample resources for schools to use with their communities.

Collecting and Disseminating Effective Practices

Since its Year of the Family in Education initiative 15 years ago, the WDPI has published and disseminated quality resources on family-school-community partnerships. State Superintendent Burmaster places a high priority on partnerships and convened a Parent Leadership Corps to seek out successful practices of family-school-community partnerships, share information on positive programs and resources, and help parents network with each other to initiate school wide student achievement projects. Its preliminary report is due in December.

Through its use of the research of Joyce Epstein on the Six Types of Partnerships (parenting, communicating, learning at home, volunteering, decision making, and collaborating) and its charter membership in the National Network of Partnership Schools, the DPI has promoted a practical framework to help schools to develop and implement effective practices. Its publications provide information on processes as well as stories of successful practices. For more information, see the Family-Community-School Partnership Team website at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dltcl/bbfensp/fcsphome.html>.

The WDPI conducts conferences on partnerships and used those opportunities to seek out and disseminate effective practices.

It is especially pleased to be one of the few state agencies to have both VISTA and AmeriCorps grants through the Corporation for National and Community Service. The focus of the grants is to promote through family-school-community partnerships. As a result, it has been able to facilitate excellent partnership efforts locally and share the results statewide.

Publicizing Results

The WDPI's Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) provides an excellent vehicle to disseminate and publicize results of the SEA's review required by section 1111(b) (2). Additionally, the WDPI will use the public media and its web site, including its

electronic newsletter Ed Forum. It will also seek advice from the State Superintendent's Parent Leadership Corps and the Wisconsin School Public Relations Association on further meeting this requirement.

Parents Right to Know Provisions

The WDPI has made a commitment to produce materials that are understandable to parents. It has translated information to parents in Spanish, Hmong, and Laotian and reminds LEAs that they need to be able to communicate to their parents in languages they understand. Considering the diversity of languages that are spoken by Wisconsin citizens, the WDPI recognizes the challenge faced by school staff in reaching parents. Schools need to rely on bi- and multi-lingual parents who can help communicate with parents whose first language isn't English. The DPI will model providing information generically, including putting information on its web site. It will also provide technical assistance and resources to help schools do this locally.

Plans, Guidelines, and Procedures for Identifying and Compiling Lists for Supplemental Educational Services

The WDPI has developed a request for proposals and a bulletin on supplemental services, but is waiting for promised guidance from the USDE before finalizing the materials. As required by the legislation, the WDPI will seek advice from parents and others to "promote maximum participation by providers to ensure to the extent practicable that parents have as many choices as possible." It will include information on its web site and in information to media about the process for seeking supplemental service providers. The WDPI will ask parent groups to suggest potential vendors and send copies of the RFP to key state and community group working with schools.

The WDPI will widely disseminate a two-page request for proposal for vendors to apply to offer supplemental educational services. It will publish a legal notice in the state newspaper, advising the process for vendors. It will also disseminate information to institutions of higher education and school districts. It will include the process for adding to the list of providers. The WDPI expects to have a list by the start of the school year.

Recognizing that parents have to feel comfortable with the providers, the WDPI will encourage helping parents in selecting providers that will best serve their children's needs.

f. Secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part I.

Baseline and follow-up data discussed in the "Framework for ESEA Accountability" will be gathered primarily under the following three reporting mechanisms: Wisconsin Student Assessment System; Wisconsin School Performance Report; and individual program reports. The department is currently identifying all data requirement responsibilities of the ESEA and is developing plans to ensure data collection mechanisms are in compliance with the ESEA. Modifications to the Wisconsin Student Assessment System, Wisconsin School Performance Report, and individual program reports will be made as necessary.

*6. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe how*

a. SEA officials and staff consulted with the Governor's office in the development of the state plan;

Two meetings between members of the WDPI ESEA planning group and representatives from the Governor's office have taken place to date. A draft state plan was provided to the Governor's office for review on May 16.

- b. *State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs with state-level activities the state administers;*

The WDPI administers many state programs and activities which support the agency's goals as articulated under the New Wisconsin Promise (NWP) and the principles of the ESEA. An outline of WDPI Divisions and Teams can be found at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/progindex.html>. The department already has staff members and teams with responsibility for administration and coordination of state and federal activities in the areas of alcohol and other drug abuse prevention, bi-lingual education, class size reduction, children with disabilities, early childhood education/Head Start, family/school/community collaboration, library development, pre-college programs for disadvantaged students, school lunch and breakfast programs, service learning, teacher training and professional development, and technology integration.

- c. *State officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, and nonprofit organizations;*

Future coordination will be enhanced by continuing, as appropriate, to support staff members with both state and federal funds to ensure that activities allowed under both sources are fully integrated both within the WDPI and in schools and LEAs. Initiatives supported by both state and federal funds will be placed within the same team in the organizational structure or ongoing work of collaborative groups involving staff members from all the various teams and divisions will be encouraged and strengthened. state officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, nonprofit organizations; and

Four public hearings were conducted to get input from the general public regarding the content of the proposed ESEA state plan. Representatives from all parts of the state and from both the public, private, and non-profit sector had an opportunity for input.

The WDPI ESEA coordinating committee will ensure that input into the implementation of the ESEA is sought from interest groups, including:

- Wisconsin School Administrators Alliance.
- Wisconsin Education Association Council.
- Wisconsin Association of School Boards.
- Wisconsin Council of Religious and Independent Schools.
- Wisconsin Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wisconsin Federation of Teachers.
- Cooperative Educational Service Agencies.

The state superintendent also has a strong role in providing leadership to the governor, the state Legislature, the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, the Wisconsin Technical College System Board, the Technology for Educational Achievement in Wisconsin (TEACH WI) Board, the PK-16 Council, the media, school districts, and the general public on all issues relating to public education. The state superintendent and department staff members will serve as liaison to

these organizations regarding the planning for and implementation of the provisions of both the NWP and the ESEA, and will ensure appropriate opportunities for their involvement. The state superintendent will also provide leadership to develop partnerships with all agencies and organizations to provide technical assistance to school districts regarding the implementation of the NWP and ESEA and to ensure their involvement in the establishment of state goals, performance indicators, and accountability provisions.

- d. *State officials and staff will coordinate with other agencies, including the Governor's office, and with other Federal programs (including those authorized by Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act).*

The cross agency committee responsible for the development of the ESEA state plan included representatives from all program areas include in the ESEA as well as program administrators for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), vocational and technical education, Head Start, Adult and Family Literacy and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Act. Representatives from the committee met with representatives from the governor's office on the development of the plan, and will continue to provide information to, and seek input from, these individuals regarding plan implementation.

1. The WDPI already has strong working relationships with many other agencies within state government and around the state on programs and activities supported under ESEA and consistent with the NWP. Examples include: The Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners consisting of over 96 state and local agencies will link the ESEA to state and federal early childhood initiatives including Head Start. The goal of this partnership is to facilitate the development and implementation of a plan that permits every child and family in Wisconsin access to a blended, comprehensive delivery system for high quality early childhood care and education. The NWP and the provisions of the ESEA impacting early childhood will be integral parts of that plan.
2. The WDPI coordinates state level activities related to instructional technology (**ESEA Title II**) with the following groups:
 - **CESA Instructional Technology Service Council (CITSC)**, made up of one representative from each CESA, WDPI, and Educational Communications Board (ECB).
 - **State Superintendent's Advisory Committee for Title II, Part D "Ed Tech" Program**, made up of representation from many of the organizations already listed above and the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU), UW System, WEMA, TEACH WI, and large, medium, small school districts.
 - **Wisconsin Educational Media Association (WEMA)**, made up of library media specialists, professional technology staff, curriculum coordinators, and administrators.
 - **Wisconsin Association of Distance Education Networks (WADEN)**, made up of directors of the distance learning networks and several state agencies.
 - **Educational Communications Board (ECB)**, made up of the state superintendent, legislators, private citizens, public and private education members, and several state agencies.

These organizations hold regular meetings throughout the year. WDPI staff members serve on all of these boards or councils.

3. The following list describes groups and methods to be used to coordinate state level activities related to limited English proficient (LEP) and immigrant students (**ESEA Title III**):
 - **Center for Southeast Asian Parents, Inc.**, Milwaukee, WI. WDPI Equity Team provides parent training on school board activities (Lao and Hmong).
 - **Hmong Education Advancement, Inc.**, Milwaukee, WI. WDPI Equity Team provides parent training on school board activities.
 - **Southeast Asian Network**, Milwaukee, WI. A group of community business people, school counselors, teachers, engineers, etc. working with students. The Equity Team assists with grant writing and partnership with universities and LEAs.
 - **State Refugee Advisory Council**. Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services—education issues, social services, and refugee issues.
 - **State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Bilingual/ESL Education**. The purpose of the council is to collect information, study issues, advise the state superintendent, and develop statewide recommendations related to the provision of bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) educational services in Wisconsin.
 - **Wisconsin United Coalition of Mutual Assistance Association (WUCMAA)**, a refugee group working with the WDPI Equity Team on education issues and parent training.
 - **Wisconsin Association for Bilingual Education (WIABE)**. According to Sec. 3115(C)(2)(A)-(D), EMT provides data, presents workshops at conferences, and advertises events/conference on our listserv for WIABE. WIABE provides high-quality professional development to classroom teachers, principals, administrators, and other school or CBO personnel.
 - **Wisconsin Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (WITESOL)**. WDPI Equity Mission Team (EMT) provides data, presents workshops at conferences, and advertises events/conferences on our listserv for WITESOL.
4. The following describes groups and methods to be used to coordinate state level activities related to drug and violence prevention (**ESEA Title IV**).
 - **State Council on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA)**. WDPI and Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) serve on planning and funding, interagency coordinating, and prevention committees and councils to share information and to develop common goals and strategies.
 - **State Incentive Grant (SIG)**. Through the State Council on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Prevention Committee which now serves as the SIG oversight board, WDPI coordinates with the Wisconsin DHFS, the Department of Justice (WDOJ), the Department of Transportation (WDOT), and other state organizations in sharing information and setting common goals and strategies.
 - **Comprehensive School Health Program**. WDPI and WDHFS jointly carry out a comprehensive school health program initiative to coordinate efforts related to school-based and school-linked prevention programs. This includes a formal memorandum of understanding signed by the heads of both agencies and interagency workgroups on

issues related to tobacco. Each agency has numerous liaisons with other state agencies and organizations related to school-based prevention programs.

- **Wisconsin Tobacco Control Board.** WDPI serves on the board and its Training and Technical Assistance and Youth Prevention Committee. WDPI administers the School Tobacco Program; WDHFS staff provides technical assistance to it. WDHFS administers the Melvin Youth Tobacco Program, Coalition, and Training and Technical Assistance Programs; WDPI staff provides assistance for these. Staff from both agencies take part in board-sponsored meetings in order to coordinate efforts.
- **State Superintendent's AODA Advisory Council.** The council provides policy recommendations and directions for drug and violence prevention programs. The council includes representatives from the University of Wisconsin System, human service agencies, community foundations, and schools.
- Staff will consult with the **State Superintendent's Parent Leadership Corps** regarding implementation of drug and violence prevention programs.
- **State Suicide Workgroup.** WDPI and WDHFS participate with other organizations in a statewide committee to develop and coordinate efforts to prevent and intervene in youth suicide.
- **Department of Justice.** WDPI staff routinely coordinate with the WDOJ to carry out training and resource development regarding safe schools issues.

7. *In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the strategies the state will use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting state and local goals and desired program outcomes. In doing so, the SEA should also describe how it will use data it gathers from subgrantees on how well they are meeting state performance targets, and the actions the state will take to determine or revise interventions for any LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees that are not making substantial progress.*

The WDPI will use the following strategies to determine progress:

- WDPI program consultants will provide personal contact through postal mail, E-mail, and telephone with the subgrant program coordinator.
- WDPI program consultants and other staff will provide support for data collection based on data collection requirements in the NCLB, such as pre- and post-implementation assessments.
- WDPI will require all subgrantees to submit written summaries of progress at least annually.
- WDPI will require all subgrantees to report on specific performance indicators annually.
- WDPI staff will conduct annual conferences for sharing the success of funded projects.
- WDPI will monitor assessment results of student achievement in the WKCE to determine progress and technical assistance needs of LEAs.
- WDPI will provide assistance to districts in addressing Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards.

The WDPI will place additional emphasis on monitoring and assisting schools identified for improvement, and will provide technical assistance to those LEAs not making substantial progress by doing the following:

- Conduct regional meetings for sharing results and technical assistance.
- Provide support for regional meetings/workshops to be conducted jointly with the CESAs for LEAs in need of improvement.
- Provide technical assistance on an individual project at regional meetings and at scheduled conferences.
- Require as part of the consolidated application, data driven identification of need through the use of a current measurable needs assessment.
- Provide technical assistance through WDPI's online district report card and support site, WINSS, which includes sections on best practices and resources for school improvement.

Part III: ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information

The Department has an overall responsibility for ensuring the programmatic and fiscal integrity of the ESEA programs. To meet this responsibility, the Department has determined that before it awards FY 2002 program funds on the basis of the consolidated application, it will review and approve information on how the state will comply with a few key requirements of the individual ESEA programs included in the application. Those programmatic and fiscal requirements are listed below.

In preparing a reply to the Part III request for information, states may find it helpful to align responses to ESEA goals. Funds from some ESEA programs explicitly support all of the ESEA goals (e.g. Title V) while other program funds concentrate on a specific ESEA goal (e.g. Title IV, Part A). To facilitate this alignment, we indicate the number of the ESEA goal(s) that we believe to be related to each program. (See also the “Alignment between ESEA Programs and ESEA Goals” chart in the General Introduction.)

*Instructions: In the **June 2002 submission**, for items 1-14 and the two final questions on uses of funds, please provide a brief narrative response. Where applicable, the state may include Web site references, electronic files, or other existing documentation to comply with the requirements listed in the application. (All electronic references and hyperlinks should point explicitly to applicable content.)*

1. Title I, Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. *Identify the amount of the reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the state will use for state-level activities and describe those activities.*

Two percent of Title I, Part A funds in the first year and 4% in the second year may be used for school improvement activities. This amounts to approximately \$3,052,866 in the first year. Of this, 5% or \$152,643 may be used by WDPI for administration, evaluation and technical assistance. The other 95% must be allocated directly to school identified for improvement. WDPI plans to offer the services described in Part II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs, [#4, page 53](#) to schools identified for improvement. However, since WDPI receives such a small amount of funds, school districts would be charged back for many of the services. School districts could use school improvement funds for these services.

- b. *For the 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) that must be made available to LEAs, describe how the SEA will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.*

WDPI will award grants of \$50,000 to \$500,000 to schools identified for improvement including schools with the lowest achievement in the greatest number of content areas, schools with the highest numbers of students enrolled for a full academic year, and schools with the greatest need determined by their poverty status. The schools must also be willing to integrate these funds with other ESEA funds awarded by the state. In order to continue to receive funds for the second and third year, the schools must be making progress towards their school improvement goals and must have a plan for sustained improvement after this funding is expired.

WDPI may, with the approval of the LEAs, provide services directly to them, or arrange for their provision through other entities such as school support teams or educational service agencies.

- c. *Identify what part, if any, of state administrative funds the SEA will use for assessment development under section 1004 of the ESEA, and describe how those funds will be used.*

A total of \$158,000 will be used from Title I Part A funds for assessment development.

The SEA has allocated funds for a full time position in the Office of Educational Accountability for the coordination of activities related to the Assessment and Accountability provisions under Title I. The duties of this position involve working with test vendors, consultants, and SEA personnel; conducting alignment studies; and reviewing and working with issues related to alternate assessment and accommodations. Administrative funds are also used to fund alignment studies, advisory committees, and other entities required to be involved in the review and approval of assessment tools.

- d. *Describe how the state will inform LEAs of the procedures they must use to distribute funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1116(e) (6) and (7) and the procedures for determining the amount to be used for this purpose.*

The WDPI developed a bulletin on supplemental educational services to be distributed to all LEAs and posted on the WDPI website; however, it is waiting for guidance from the USDE before making it public.

The WDPI will advise the school districts that under Title I of the reauthorized ESEA, parents whose children attend schools that have been identified as schools “in improvement” have two new options for their children’s education. The first option is to send their children to another public school that has not been identified as “in improvement” (including a public charter school) in the district. The second option, which is limited to low-income families, is to obtain supplemental educational services for their children.

Districts with schools in improvement will be **required** to spend 20% of Title I funds to provide transportation for public school choice and supplemental services (Title I, Part A, Section 1116(b)(10)(A)). The required breakdown is:

- 5% must be used to provide supplemental educational services (section 1116(b)(10)(B)).
- 5% must be used to provide, or pay for, transportation for public school choice (section 1116(b)(10)(ii)).
- 10% can be divided up between these two uses noted above (supplemental services, transportation under public school choice, or both), as the LEA determines.

The formula for the amount the school district **shall** make available for supplemental services for each child receiving these services is the lesser of 1) the amount of the agency’s Title I, Part A allocation divided by the number of children from families below the poverty level, ages 5-17, **or** 2) the actual cost of the services received by the child. Section 1116(e)(6).

The statute acknowledges that the amount the LEA chooses to spend on supplemental services may not be sufficient to provide supplemental services to all eligible students (whether the LEA chooses to spend the 5% minimum, the 15% maximum, or somewhere in between). Accordingly, if funds are insufficient to provide supplemental educational services to all eligible children whose parents request such services, the LEA is authorized to prioritize the services for eligible students who are the lowest-achieving children (section 1116(b)(10)(C)).

School districts receive notice of their Title I allocation each spring from the WDPI.

A request for proposal (RFP) will be made available to vendors. The WDPI will publish a legal notice, indicating the availability of the RFP as well as sending information to the media.

LEAs notified that they are in need of improvement will receive a list of supplemental educational service providers.

- e. *Describe how the state will use the formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of state assessments in accordance with section 6111.*

Wisconsin will initially use formula funds to design, develop, and implement additional or new standards and assessments in grades 3-8 in reading/language arts and mathematics as well as science in at least one grade in the span of grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 to meet the requirements of NCLB. Wisconsin anticipates that with remaining formula funds it will then develop and implement activities designed to meet requirements described in NCLB Title VI, Part A, Section 6111.(2) (A) through (H).

“(A) Developing challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b).”

“(B) Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7).”

“(C) Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of state assessments.”

“(D) Refining state assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the state’s academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials.”

“(E) Developing multiple measure to increase the reliability and validity of state assessment systems.”

“(F) Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with state student academic achievement standards and assessments.”

“(G) Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with state academic achievement standards and assessments.”

“(H) Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time.”

2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3—Even Start Family Literacy [Goals 1,2,5]

- a. *Describe how the SEA will use its indicators of program quality to monitor, evaluate, and improve its projects, and to decide whether to continue operating them.*

Through the Wisconsin Statewide Family Literacy Initiative, there is a commissioned White Paper Study to provide us with valuable information about the relationship between program quality indicators and participant outcomes. This will take place in the spring and summer of 2002 with 8 of Wisconsin's 22 sites. The principal investigator is Dr. Betty Hayes of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The study will provide information about the strengths and weaknesses of the documents described below for monitoring and program improvement, however, the primary purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between the selected indicators of program quality and the participant performance outcomes. While it is assumed that indicators of program quality have a relationship to participant performance outcomes, such a relationship has not been established. The ultimate goal of this project is to enhance our understanding of how to develop and sustain successful Even Start Family Literacy programs.

The state does a combination of paper review and on-site state and peer review of projects. In addition, we have developed, updated and refined three documents that will serve as vehicles to enable informed decisions to be made about the progress of Even Start Family Literacy projects and how they may be improved, and whether they should continue to operate:

1. **The Continuous Progress Assessment Guide (CPA)**, used as a self assessment guide for local project staff and participants based on the quality indicators that RMC Research has published to assist Even Start programs. This guide covers the required 15 program elements. [The section on use of local evaluation will be modified to specifically ask what the results are of local program objectives.](#) The final page asks for program recommendations, a response to each recommendation, and the person, or group making the recommendation such as the evaluator. This assists with continuous program improvement efforts. After it is completed, a copy is sent to the State Even Start Family Literacy Program Coordinator at least 2 weeks before a scheduled on site state and peer review. Projects can suggest what components they especially want the reviewers to focus on during the on site visit. They also prepare for the visit by setting up an itinerary or schedule. It includes opportunities to observe the program's core components, time for the on-site team to talk with staff, parents and collaborative partners, plus time for a concluding exit interview. This is submitted to the state with the CPA.
2. **The Wisconsin Even Start Family Literacy Program Indicators Monitoring Document.**

This document is used as a staff self assessment tool, a local evaluator tool to be used for evaluator site visits, and by state and peer reviewers. It uses a combination rubric of Program Quality Indicators and Participant Performance Indicators.

At each on-site visit, or during self assessment, the reviewers will record ratings of "fully met," "partially met," or "not met."

For each item that is "partially met," or "not met," the reviewers must write recommendations for continuous program improvement.
3. **Even Start Family Literacy Local Program Evaluation Review:** This is a form to assess local evaluations by state reviewers. It is designed in a similar, but not identical fashion to the monitoring document in number 2 above in that the reviewer checks "included," "not included," or "approved pending further clarification." If the reviewer finds that something is not included or is pending further clarification comments are to be made. There is a summary page of overall comments. Feedback will be given to local independent evaluators and projects.

b. Describe what constitutes sufficient program progress when the SEA makes continuation awards.

When the SEA makes continuation awards, it first considers the most current local evaluation and the accompanying application for funding. Then the Continuous Progress Assessment (CPA), as well as the evaluation is used with the monitoring documents which were explained above. There is a point system that is applied as follows:

For the Quality Indicators section, the reviewers will award total points based on maturity of the program and achievement of program in each domain.

For the Performance Indicators section, the reviewers will award total points based on maturity of the program and achievement of participants in each domain.

On the Quality Indicators:

- a project may receive full points if 9-13 or more of the domains are partially or fully met
- a project may receive 80 percent of points if 5-8 of the domains are partially or fully met
- a project may receive 60 percent of points if 2-4 of the domains are partially or fully met
- a project may receive 50 percent of points if 3 or more categories are partially met
- For all other combinations, a project will receive 30 percent of points

On the Performance Indicators:

- a project may receive full points if 5-7 of the categories are partially or fully met
- a project may receive 80 percent of points if 3-4 of the categories are partially or fully met
- a project may receive 60 percent of points if 2 of the categories are partially or fully met
- a project may receive 50 percent of points if 3 or more categories are partially met
- For all other combinations, a project will receive 30 percent of points

Approval Requirements

- Projects receiving between 80-100 total points are approved for continued funding
- Projects receiving between 60-79 total points are conditionally approved (contingent on program improvements) for continued funding; timelines may vary
- Projects receiving less than 60 total points are not approved for continued funding.

There is a page for comments after each section and overall comments at the end.

Next steps in developing our state system:

- The SEA in coordination with the Statewide Family Literacy Initiative Consortium will analyze the first formal end of the year data this summer and compare it to our baseline

data from our partial year of collecting data on our new, draft performance indicators of program quality for children and adults.

- Then we will see what lessons we have learned and perhaps amend our draft indicators.
- Benchmarks will have to be established for continuous program improvement
- A final process will be developed in 2002 that articulates how and when program improvement and technical assistance is given to projects that are identified in need of improvement.
- A way to determine when program improvement efforts have been tried and progress has not been made will be established in order to discontinue funds for a program.

- c. *Explain how the state's Even Start projects will provide assistance to low-income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable state content and student achievement standards.*

The state's Even Start project's will provide assistance to low income families participating in the program to help children in those families achieve to the applicable state content and achievement standards. For the children this will be done by providing directly, or through partnerships with Title I, Part A or C, Head Start or other entities a quality infant- toddler and preschool age program for children below public school kindergarten age. The curriculum in the preschool program will have a quality language development and pre-reading core. Staff will concentrate on smooth transitions to public school by collaborating with the Title I Part A program and the school's transition program which is in place. As long as the family is part of the Even Start Family Literacy program there will be opportunities for tutoring and reinforcement of what is going on in the classroom at school.

For the parents, regular parent education sessions are held that include help with issues that are requested by parents or planned for and provided in collaboration with families. These sessions help parents to understand the standards, assessments and curriculum that are in school. In addition, topics like setting up a study area and homework environment are included. Parents usually need to know how to navigate through the maze of the school or LEA to get needs met and advocate for their child. Home visits are another avenue of supporting parents with parent/child literacy and learning activity ideas and how to support their children's learning at home and as a partner with schools.

- d. *Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the state will use for each category of state-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the SEA will carry out those activities.*

Three percent of the Even Start allocation was reserved for state administration which equaled \$97,500, and another three percent was reserved for technical assistance. Administration mainly covers salaries and fringes of state staff, mileage to visit projects, necessary supplies and materials, basic meetings and basic professional development for funded projects.

Technical assistance activities focused on the development, and implementation of state indicators of program quality and individual performance indicators; data collection and reporting; development of the parent education component, and scientifically based reading research and how to implement that across program components. As the legislation required, other than for the work with indicators, third parties who have experience and credibility delivering training to family literacy programs were used for technical assistance. Two major

outside entities were Dr. Douglas Powell from Purdue who authored the *Guide to Improving Parenting Education*, and the National Center for Family Literacy. Access to training was provided to all appropriate project personnel.

Basic program information:

There are 22 federally funded Even Start subgrants in Wisconsin. There is a balance between urban and rural programs. Last year's data revealed that 1,012 families were served for at least one complete year. Those families included 1,132 adults, 418 of whom were English language learners. These families had 1,442 children whose ages ranged from birth to age eight.

The average size of a subgrant in Wisconsin is \$126,257. Subgrants range from \$55,075 to \$220,000.

The average hours of instruction per month offered to families were:

Adult Education:	29
Early Childhood Education (0-2)	27
Early Childhood Education (3-4)	32
Early Childhood Education (5 and older)	29
Parenting Education	8

The Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment were:

Newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty:	66%
Newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED:	79%
Newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade:	39%

Newly enrolled families in each program year that remain in the program:

1997-1998 Cohort

a. Less than three months	20%
b. From 4 to 6 months	18%
c. From 7 to 12 months	26%
d. More than 12 months	35%

1998-1999 Cohort

a. Less than three months	16%
b. From 4 to 6 months	13%
c. From 7 to 12 months	28%
d. More than 12 months	42%

1999-2000 Cohort

a. Less than three months	12%
b. From 4 to 6 months	19%
c. From 7 to 12 months	32%
d. More than 12 months	38%

2000-2001 Cohort

a.	Less than three months	21%
b.	From 4 to 6 months	36%
c.	From 7 to 12 months	43%

3. Title I, Part C—Education of Migrant Children [Goals 1,2,5]

- a. *Describe the process the state will use to develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children.*

Annually, the SEA conducts a comprehensive needs assessment. The state migrant education program staff works in consort with appropriate parties within the department and externally to collect and analyze multiple sources of the data sources. The data include:

- State academic achievement results for districts with residential migrant students and disaggregated data on migrant students statewide.
- Profiles of information available from the New Generation System.
- Evaluation surveys from both summer and school-year local projects.
- Agriculture information reports on the expected location of the migratory labor force.
- Results of interviews with parents and project personnel by state staff.
- State agency reports on migratory housing, camp regulations, and health services.
- Surveys and meetings with other state agencies that provide services to migrant workers (helps avoid duplication of services and provides better use of everyone's time).
- Findings of the statewide recruiter on new populations entering or leaving project areas.

Careful attention is paid to academic achievement profiles, the extent of over-age students in the migrant population, and the subject areas that appear to be of high need for additional support to enable students to attain the high standards expected of all students. The WDPI migrant education staff reviews student reporting forms to take stock of credit accrual successes and obvious needs to be addressed.

Results of the annual needs assessment process are used to establish the statewide priorities for services through the local projects and provide the basis for the allocation of funds. Gaps in academic achievement patterns in core subjects and gaps in services are pinpointed to help develop quality local applications, which will include plans for professional staff development for school and partnership agency staff.

Review of the data provides information on returning migrant students who have been identified as needing special education services. With that information, local projects can preplan so that these children may participate in the summer projects.

Throughout the planning and setting priorities, staff are encouraged to carefully consider migratory lifestyle, educational disruption, risk of failure to meet the academic standards, cultural or language barriers, and social isolation. These factors along with the availability of other programs and services and the degree to which these programs are meeting the respective needs of the migrant student population in a respective service area directly impact the decisions on use of migrant program funding or amount needed.

In summary, the state's needs assessment process is conducted in five phases, including:

1. Exploring current status.
2. Gathering and analyzing data.
3. Making decisions as to priority needs.
4. Determining solution to meet priority needs.
5. Informing all parties of the action plan and the expectations for service delivery to impact the needs of migrant students.

Local projects include data in the service delivery plan that reflects changes in student demographics.

- b. *Describe the state's priorities for the use of migrant education program funds in order to have migrant students meet the state's performance targets for indicators 1.1 and 1.2 in Part I (as well as 5.1 and 5.2 that expressly include migrant students), and how they relate to the state's assessment of needs for services.*

The state and local efforts will focus on developing challenging content and performance standards. This effort will align instruction, curricula, and assessment for the improvement of teaching and learning to address the priority needs of at-risk migrant students. The performance goals set forth by the state and these respective performance indicators will give direction to the design, review, and approval of local projects. The use of migrant funds will be targeted to help migrant students attain proficient or better levels of achievement in meeting the state academic standards and the performance targets set forth in the state consolidated plan.

The major goal of the migrant education program is for all migrant students to reach challenging academic standards and graduate with a high school diploma (or GED).

The state's first priority is to provide high quality programs and services for eligible migrant children between the ages of 3 to 21 who have moved most recently and who are failing in school, or who are most at-risk of failing to meet high standards, who are in school but are deficient in substantial coursework needed for graduation, or who are out of school. The second priority is to assist eligible migrant students between the ages of 3 to 21 who have moved less frequently but are failing in school, who are the most at-risk of failing to meet high standards, who need support to overcome deficiencies in coursework, or who are out of school. The third priority is to provide migrant students ages 3 to 21 who need additional support for academic success.

The state will guide districts to use other available resources and from the migrant education program to positively impact performance indicators applying to migrant children and to increase the number of students achieving at proficient or above levels. The annual assessment of needs and findings on the number of students identified for each of these respective indicators will be of paramount importance in planning strategies in the following key areas reflecting the highest needs:

- Percentage of migrant students proficient in reading.
- Percentage of migrant students proficient in mathematics.
- Percentage of migrant students reading at grade level or above in grades 1 to 3.
- Percentage of migrant students who complete high school.

- The number of migrant students who drop out of school after entering grades 7 to 12.
- Percentage of migrant students who are enrolled in schools in need of improvement. (The state will ensure that parents of migrant students attending such schools are advised about opportunities for choice options and supplemental services to assist their children with learning.)

The state will ensure that professional development support is available to educators working with migrant students to enhance their success through improved teaching and learning. If Reading First funding is received by the state and it is awarded to a district serving migrant students, these students will be included in the special activities designed to ensure all students read well and independently by the end of third grade. This will be a priority goal whether or not these funds are received. Parents of migrant students will be engaged in learning opportunities focused on the important goals and indicators and how they can support their children's learning. Diligent monitoring of how migrant students are succeeding in these areas when compared to non-migrant students will be carried out to determine how to strengthen programs and services to support students' efforts to attain proficiency or better achievement levels and be successful in completion of their high school courses of study. The state will promote intra and interstate coordination in its efforts to be successful in its treatment of the performance goals and specific performance indicators targeted to migrant students. Of particular emphasis will be the efforts to assist secondary level students to access courses needed and receive credits needed to graduate from high school.

- c. *Describe how the state will determine the amount of any subgrants the state will award to local operating agencies, taking into account the numbers and needs of migrant children, the statutory priority for service in section 1304(d), and the availability of funds from other federal, state, and local programs. (Applicable only if not previously addressed in Part II, #2.)*

The state will direct the migrant education program funds toward support of high-quality and comprehensive educational programs for migratory children to help reduce the gaps in learning from educational disruptions and other problems that have resulted from repeated moves. The state will make every effort to provide appropriate educational services and support services that address the special needs of migrant students in a coordinated and efficient manner. The state has provided inservices to its local project directors emphasizing that when targeting funds, the state is required to take into account the needs of the students and the degree to which those needs are not being met through other programs and resources. The availability of other federal, state, and local funds and an appropriate use of those funds, including funds for services that the district is obligated to provide, are all evaluated. The districts in this state are well aware that if the migrant student population is not residing in the area, that there is no automatic guarantee of a migrant program allocation.

After a state needs assessment is completed, the state will notify districts on the procedures for applying for funds for their migrant population.

Local districts submit a plan for delivery of services that is designed to meet the academic and support services needs of migrant students. The review of the applications by state education staff determines the appropriateness of the plan of services, the degree of integration and coordination with other available local, state, and federal programs and resources and its potential for impacting the state's key performance goals and related objectives. The number of students with severe needs and the range of services that will be needed in a local project also determine the amount of funding to be awarded. Projects may be awarded additional funding to provide services to elementary and secondary level students across the K-12 grade span. There are some services

that need to be funded by the migrant education program (MEP) during the summer period that will not be given consideration during the regular year. The state ensures that other federal funds are employed such as those available from Title I, Part A and those from the School Food and Nutrition programs. The state will ensure that all districts with schoolwide programs serving migrant children are aware of the new provision in the law pertaining to the first priority use of the MEP funds to meet the unique needs of migrant students.

- d. *Describe how the state will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migrant children.*

The state actively pursues connections with key personnel in other states to benefit the migrant students that attend Wisconsin schools for a part of the year. Through coordination with the Texas Migrant Interstate Office, secondary level students are able to take the TAAS test while working and attending schools in Wisconsin. Careful planning to set up testing centers is carried out by Wisconsin and Texas staff. Tutoring is available for many of the students and the state has trained four individuals who can conduct the administration of the tests at these sites. The Wisconsin Migrant Education program consultant and CESA # 8 secondary service coordinator travel to the home base state of the migrant students attending schools in this state and exchange information with the school counselors and district administrators about programs and services available here. Wisconsin provides information to other states at no charge, and follow up work is done by phone and fax to connect with educators and counselors in the other states to help migrant students on the road to graduation. This will continue as the state moves to full implementation of the NCLB. The state supports the attendance of migrant education program staff at national conferences where there can be networking with other state leaders and educators to find better ways to coordinate more continuity of instruction for migrant students that attend school in multiple states. The state works with its local projects to ensure that information on students is shared with the next school site the student will be attending. There is always the effort to ensure the exchange of information on a timely basis to benefit the migrant student's credit accrual and placement opportunities. Information is sent with the parents, and the electronic information is kept in an up-to-date manner for sharing.

- e. *Describe the state's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its migrant education program and projects.*

The state will ensure that migrant students are included in the state assessments, including the statewide assessment for English language learners, as appropriate. Analysis of the disaggregated migrant subgroup data will provide informative profiles of the effectiveness of the programs and services in meeting the needs of migrant students to improve achievement levels. Local achievement data during the regular school term will be analyzed and discussed during on-site reviews. Progress monitoring of the success of the migrant students in relationship to the performance targets when compared to the non-migrant students will be examined and the findings employed in continued planning. Local projects will complete a self-assessment instrument and this will be reviewed during project visits by state migrant education program staff for the purpose of monitoring and technical assistance. At the conclusion of the summer programs, an instrument will be completed by the local project staff indicating the degree of success toward meeting the program objectives. Interviews with parents and project personnel will identify perceptions of the effectiveness of the programs and services and pinpoint areas of concern regarding changes needed to strengthen efforts.

- f. *Identify the amount of funds that the SEA will retain from its Migrant Education Program (MEP) allocation, under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations (34 CFR 200.41), to carry out*

administrative and program functions that are unique to the MEP, and describe how the SEA will use those funds.

The state will reserve the allowable 1 percent of funds for program administration. The state's preliminary allocation has been identified as \$616, 043. This would yield an amount of \$6,160 for indirect cost. Title I Part A funds cover the cost of the Title I program coordinator's work with the migrant education program. For the program operation functions performed by the state migrant education program staff that are unique to the migrant education program, an amount of \$243,000 will be retained. These funds will cover costs incurred for the following:

- Salaries/fringe for staff with migrant education program specific assignments:
 - Statewide recruiter with identification and recruitment responsibilities.
 - Migrant education program consultant-secondary level support for students needing credit accrual assistance, and opportunities for TAAS testing.
 - Program assistant entering data into the electronic New Generation System, monitoring the quality of the data, and responding to 800 emergency calls from migrant families.
 - Program assistant completing tasks for the migrant education program staff.
- Contractual/other costs for inservices provided by the state MEP staff for local migrant education summer/regular year staff.
- Migrant parent involvement support, including travel to national conferences, training, and materials.
- Printing costs for migrant education program materials.
- State migrant staff travel to out-of-state meetings relevant to migrant education program (national conferences, coordination with home-based state school personnel).
- In-state travel to monitor projects, recruitment of migrant students.
- Intra and interstate coordination initiatives.
- Data processing costs.
- Repair of computer hardware.

The remaining funds will be utilized for grants awarded to approved summer projects and regular term projects focused on the improvement of academic performance of migrant children so that migrant students perform as well as non-migrant students.

4. Title I, Part D—Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk [Goals 1,2,5]

- a. *Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the state has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.* The state will provide leadership to support the operation of local educational agency programs that involve collaboration with state and locally operated correctional facilities. The goals to be pursued include:

1. Planning and implementation of high quality education programs designed to prepare children and youth for secondary school completion, training, employment or further education.
2. Providing activities to facilitate the transition of such children and youth from the correctional program to further education or employment.
3. Assisting districts and local correctional institutions to design and operate programs in local schools for children and youth returning from correctional facilities and programs that may serve at-risk children and youth.
4. Assisting state agency operated correctional programs to address the academic support needs of incarcerated youth who may return to the local districts.

Further, the state will pursue the development of more effective transition programs in the state to benefit the students that return to the local school district. Districts/institutions eligible for the Title I, Part D funds will be given support as they plan for and implement new transition program approaches.

Program effectiveness will be based on student outcomes. Title I, Part D funds will be used for students to:

1. Maintain and improve educational achievement.
2. Accrue school credits that meet state requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation.
3. Make transition to a regular program or other education program operated by a local educational agency or community day program.
4. Complete secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements) and obtain employment after leaving the correctional facility or institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth.
5. Participate in postsecondary education and job training programs.

Multiple and appropriate measures will be utilized to determine student progress in items 1-5 above. The state will ensure there is disaggregation of data by gender, race, ethnicity, and age, not less than once every three years, to determine the impact of the program. The reduction in the dropout rates for male and female students over a three-year period will be monitored.

The State's identified data collection sources for program improvement include the following:

Subparts 1 and 2

Annually, institutions will provide an evaluation summary of the previous year's Title I Part D program to the SEA. This summary will provide specific information on academic achievement outcomes, measures to be used, goals established, and students expected to make substantial progress and results showing percent of students meeting goals. The results are used to determine changes needed in the project to bring about improvement in instructional strategies and plan professional development to support this goal. The sources of the data for the responses to this section vary per the individual institutions. Some are utilizing standardized assessments, some other objective means of measuring student progress.

The SEA will ensure that data is collected and analyzed at each project site and reported at least that provides disaggregated profiles of information on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity and age.

This information will be provided in the annual consolidated performance report for sharing at the federal level.

The SEA will be developing a uniform evaluation plan for all programs under subparts 1 and 2.

Representatives of the state and local Subparts 1 & 2 neglected and delinquent project sites will be engaged in the initiative to develop a new uniform process for measuring the degree to which participants served in these programs are able to:

- 1) maintain and improve educational achievement;
- 2) to accrue school credits that meet State requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation;
- 3) to make the transition to a regular program operated by a local educational agency ;
- 4) to complete secondary school or secondary school equivalency requirements, and obtain employment after leaving the correctional facility or institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth; and
- 5) as appropriate to participate in post-secondary education and job training programs.

Specialists with knowledge about multiple and appropriate measures that could be considered in building a uniform system for reporting results will be involved during the developmental and post-developmental training sessions. A portion of the assessment will focus on the varying forms of transition programs and the rate of success.

In those instances where the state correction facilities have cross-program data available regarding student success in vocational and other training programs and the state academic programs, projects will be asked to coalesce documented information on how the Title I Part D students are progressing toward attainment of achievement goals by assessing degree of success outside the supplementary programs., and in other school settings, or the community.

- b. Describe how the SEA is assisting projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.*

The SEA will advise current and potential local applicants about the strong emphasis in the legislation for establishment of effective transition projects. The SEA will continue its strong advocacy for effective transition programs. Projects within the state and outside the state with

effective transition models have been identified and project staff have been invited to share their particular approaches with other projects. Projects and staff have been notified about the requirement for an increased use of Title I, Part D funds to support transition programs. More training and technical assistance will be provided. Some visitations to working models will be recommended so that the benefits of networking and collaboration can be realized.

- c. *Describe how the funds reserved under section 1418 will be used for transition services for students leaving institutions for schools served by LEAs, or postsecondary institutions or vocational and technical training programs.*

Local projects will need to demonstrate that a plan is in place for implementation when students leave the institution and return to schools, districts, or other institutions. Information regarding the process and information that will be provided to support the student's entry into the educational program will be outlined in the plan. The funds reserved for this purpose will not be less than 15 percent and may be as high as 30 percent. Along with a well-designed plan, the funds will be utilized to provide essential support services such as:

- Personal, vocational and technical, and academic counseling.
- Placement services designed to place the youth in a university, college, or junior college program.
- Information concerning and assistance in obtaining, available student financial aid.
- Counseling services.
- Job placement services.
- Provision of mentors to support students.

The SEA will work in collaboration with the neglected and delinquent institutions to develop a plan for professional development to ensure appropriate training is available to the teachers working with the students who are residents within these schools.

Approximately \$1.2 million will be made available to the state for these programs. One percent of the allocation is reserved for administration support. The remainder of the funds is disseminated to the eligible districts/institutions serving this population on a formula basis.

5. Title I, Part F—Comprehensive School Reform [Goals 1,2 5]

- a. *Describe the process the state educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform program.*

STRATEGIES TO ENSURE QUALITY

Quality assurance of the CSR programs is a critical component of the WDPI role. The WDPI staff provides on-going technical assistance and uses a variety of strategies to ensure the quality of the scientifically-based research program(s) offered by the LEAs/schools. This provision of technical assistance ensures the CSR whole school reform programs have the capacity to improve the academic achievement of all students in core academic subjects.

Annually, WDPI will disseminate materials on the CSR program, including the required 11 elements and on information related to effective, scientifically-based research programs and effective practices. The WDPI will disseminate and maintain information through the WDPI

website along with links to national and regional resources, including the USDE's National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform. CSR state reports and school abstracts will also be posted on the WDPI website. Direct mailings are made annually to announce the CSR grant cycle to each school district administrator and to all principals of schools identified for improvement.

In making the decision on the application's scientifically-based program, the WDPI will use criteria established by the USDE's guidance, detailing how to judge the effectiveness of strategies, programs, and models as most rigorous, somewhat rigorous and marginal. Only scientifically-based research programs that can answer the most rigorous and somewhat rigorous criteria will be considered for funding under the CSR program.

A variety of current evaluative materials on comprehensive school reform will be utilized in providing technical assistance to CSR schools, including:

- *A Continuum of Effectiveness and Continuum of Comprehensive Reform Strategies, Programs and Models* by USDE.
- *Catalog of School Reform Models* by the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory and the National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform.
- *The Education Commission of the States' A Policymaker's Guide to Education Reform Networks; Lessons from New American Schools' Scale-Up Phase* by the Rand Corporation.
- *An Educators Guide to School Reform, 2000* by the American Institutes for Research.

Review of these documents underscores the rigorous and high degree of component integration expected in the WDPI CSR proposals. This information will be also made available through the WDPI website, at CSR grant writing workshops, state cadre meetings and grant readings.

WDPI will continually disseminate successful school reform information through participation at federal and regional conferences/meetings provided through the USDE, Comprehensive School Reform, Title I, North Central Regional Education Lab (NCREL), Comprehensive Center-Region Six (CC-VI) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Wisconsin Center for Educational Research (WCER), and Council of Chief State Schools Organization (CCSSO). School development resources, such as USDE and NCREL's videotape series, will continue to be made available to LEAs/schools.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

As part of the program implementation evaluation, each CSR school must evaluate its comprehensive reform program including the following: (1) completing an end-of-year report and reviewing annual benchmark reviews, (2) self-evaluating the implementation level of each program component, including the 11 required elements, (3) describing the quality of service received by their external technical service provider, and (4) providing local assessment results and written individual school abstracts.

By requiring annual benchmark review and end-of-year reports, WDPI will conduct a review of each project's first year evaluation to determine the implementation level and effectiveness of the scientifically-based research model. This evaluation will be viewed as continuous, ongoing, and formative in nature. This formative evaluation will assist the WDPI in providing relevant and high-quality technical assistance to schools.

LOCAL SCHOOL ABSTRACTS AND ASSESSMENTS

The local assessments must focus on the 11 CSR components as well as other implementation issues. Local and/or state assessments may include the following school stakeholders: teachers, parents, students, administrators, school board members and community members. School abstracts will profile the school's CSR program and include descriptive information on how effective the CSR program works to raise student achievement.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Annually, the number of state-awarded CSR grants will be determined by the level of federal funding and the number of continuing CSR school projects. Technical assistance will be offered during the initial grant award year and continued throughout the three-year grant cycle. Such technical assistance will address all eleven required elements of CSR.

WDPI technical assistance is provided in various ways including telephone contacts and interviews, E-mail, surveys, state cadre meetings and grant writing workshops. The purpose of technical assistance will be to provide on-going, high-quality assistance to CSR schools to help monitor elements of required annual assessments, to network, and to identify critical strengths and/or problems.

Priority for monitoring will be given to CSR schools identified for improvement or in need of corrective action, schools participating in Title I Schoolwide programs, and/or schools participating in other state programs such as SAGE and Preschool to Grade 5 Program (P-5) (can be found at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/oue/p-5index.html>). Collaborative monitoring will be made by WDPI education consultants already working with these schools.

Cadre meetings will provide a statewide network to disseminate information, allow CSR schools to share their expertise, provide feedback on important factors which ensure success, and identify critical roadblocks that may impede effective program implementation. Also, WDPI will offer grant writing workshops to assist local schools through the application process.

Schools are required to evaluate the quality of overall technical assistance they receive, the impact of their external technical assistance service provider, and the annual implementation progress for each of the eleven required components.

- b. *Describe the process the state will use to determine the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform schools with increasing number of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.*

SEA EVALUATION STRATEGIES

The statewide evaluation of the Wisconsin CSR schools provides a basis for assuring high quality implementation of the design models and reform programs, as well as judging the effectiveness of these implementations for improving student academic achievement. The WDPI will focus its efforts on the highest need in low performing schools.

LEAs/schools are required to conduct annual assessments that focus on how their program implementation has promoted student achievement for all students. Annual academic achievement evaluation is required for all students. Base-line data will be gathered in the initial year of funding with continued data collected throughout the entire three-year grant cycle. Results will be analyzed to judge the overall effectiveness of the program's implementation and, most

importantly, to provide feedback about existing needs which, when addressed, will improve the implementation of the CSR programs.

PROGRAM EVALUATION REVIEW

The WDPI will collect and analyze local and state student achievement results as part of the annual state CSR evaluation. Other monitoring of CSR school programs may include a variety of measurements, such as individual school surveys, feedback from WDPI CSR webpages, E-mails, workshop evaluations, CSR benchmark summaries, CSR end-of-year reports, and/or telephone or written interviews of CSR school stakeholders.

The WDPI intends to make grant awards for three years to successful applicants. Annual grant awards will be made dependent upon availability of funds and demonstration of satisfactory progress. Each CSR school program will be required to submit an end-of-year report. These evaluations will be reviewed by the WDPI staff. Schools may be required to revise their plan and/or amend their program budget for the upcoming year to address changes or weaknesses as they are identified. A follow-up telephone conference may be held with CSR schools as appropriate. The re-application reviews will determine whether or not a school's grant funding is continued for another year.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The primary data for the academic achievement evaluation will come from Wisconsin's statewide assessment program, the *Wisconsin Student Assessment System* (WSAS). The WSAS includes the *Wisconsin Knowledge & Concepts Evaluations* (WKCE) achievement tests in reading, language arts, mathematics, science and social studies which are administered to students in grades four, eight and ten throughout the state. The WKCE includes local, standards-based assessments and Wisconsin alternate assessments for children with disabilities and LEP. Wisconsin is currently updating testing policies that align with the NCLB through a USDE timeline waiver agreement.

The WKCE proficiency standards are based on Wisconsin's *Model Academic Content and Performance Standards* and are scored as minimal, basic, proficient and advanced.

The achievement data from the assessments is disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, English language proficiency, disability, and economic status. WDPI will compare CSR's student achievement data to other state data, such as results from Wisconsin's Title I schoolwide programs, Title I targeted assistance programs, and non-Title I schools. CSR schools will be reviewed for their student assessment results—whether or not they meet annual yearly progress (AYP) and are a school in need of improvement. WDPI will compare CSR programs to state and national proficiency rates. Also, the department will identify CSR schools in Wisconsin that are high-poverty and high-performing schools and promising demonstration projects, and/or promising school sites as identified by the United States Department of Education.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

The impact of CSR on standardized test results in Wisconsin will be determined by comparing each year's achievement results, showing an increase in overall student achievement in meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state assessments in all five subject areas tested (including reading/language and mathematics). Summary charts and narrative to explain data will be incorporated into the CSR section of the annual Wisconsin Consolidated Performance Report.

First, the demographic characteristics of the CSRD students are compared with the state as a whole at the grades tested. Second, the lowest categories (Not Tested on WKCE and Minimal performance) are compared with the referenced groups. Third, the proportion of students scoring at Proficient or Above are shown for the most current statewide WKCE test administration. Evidence of progress for the IEP and LEP students participating in alternate assessments will also be gathered.

Because many of the CSR reform designs do not anticipate significant achievement in the first two to four years of program operation, the Wisconsin evaluation plan may gather additional data which can help indicate program effectiveness impacting students, such as attendance, expulsion/suspension, drop-out and graduation rates. The analysis of student test data and the other performance information for CSR will be reported on a statewide basis.

SUMMARY

The educational framework of all reform models is based on rigorous standards and assessments coupled with well aligned and effective curriculum and instruction. This foundation must be supported by effective management at the district, school and classroom level, on-going professional development, parental participation, and a strong focus on improving student achievement. The statewide and local evaluation strategies will allow assessment of quality and alignment of these various components.

6. Title II, Part A—Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. *If not fully addressed in the state's response to the information on performance goals, indicators, and targets in Part I describe the remainder of the state's annual measurable objectives under section 1119(a)(2).*

The WDPI will establish performance targets for performance indicators 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 under performance goal #4: "by 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers."

The WDPI will encourage Title II funds be used to instruct teachers and administrators in the use of modern technology to improve student learning. Technology is embedded in the basic standards for teachers in Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin Administrative Code (can be found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>).

The WDPI will also encourage the Title II professional development funds to mentor new teachers and provide professional development to existing staff in schools considered to be persistently dangerous. Methods of creating school safety will be emphasized in these plans.

- b. *Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable both for (1) meeting the annual measurable objectives described in section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, and (2) ensuring that the professional development the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of "professional development" in section 9101(34).*

Note: This program, and the financial support it provides to states, LEAs, and schools, is vitally important to ensure that all students have teachers who are highly qualified, and who can help students achieve to their maximum capabilities. The two items identified above supplement other information states need to provide in response to items in Part I, Goal 3; Part II, item 5, and Part III, information on Title II, Part D (Enhancing Education Through Technology program) on how they plan to implement key teacher quality activities.

- High quality professional development activities will be monitored by the use of the state-designed professional development plan. The plan is to be based on the teacher standards, including content that will measure teacher competence in the academic subjects taught, the techniques that will have a positive impact on classroom teaching, assessments linking teaching to pupil performance, and techniques that will foster relationships with the school and larger community. The plan is to be related to schoolwide improvement plans and to district goals and objectives. The plan is to be individually designed and cooperatively monitored with peers in the school and district. Finally, the plan is to be based on scientific research in teaching and learning.
- The ESEA definition for “professional development” will be included as an appendix to the professional development plan and will also be included with the training package.

c. Describe the State Educational Agency and the State Agency for Higher Education’s agreement on the amount each will retain under section 2113(d) of ESEA. Section 2113(d) allows for one percent of the state’s program allocation for administration and planning costs.

In the absence of an agreement between the two agencies to apportion the one-percent in another way, of this amount the Department annually will award to the SAHE for administration and planning the greater of-

1. The amount of FY 2001 funds it had received for administration under the predecessor Title II, ESEA Eisenhower Professional Development Program, or
2. Five percent of the amount available each year for subgrants to partnerships under ESEA section 2113(a)(2).

The amount of money eligible for administration under section 2113 (d) is 1 percent of the \$45,571,638 total Title II grant, or \$455,716. DPI will allocate \$58,556 of these administration funds to the SAHE (the amount of FY 2001 funds the SAHE received for administration under Title II, Eisenhower Professional Development Program). The remainder of the administration funds (\$397,160) will be used by DPI for administration of the LEA grants.

7. Title II, Part D—Enhanced Education Through Technology [Goals 1,2,3]

a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the state has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.

The goals of the state instructional technology program mirror those of the federal program:

- Assist LEAs in implementing and supporting a comprehensive system that effectively uses technology in elementary schools.
- Improve student academic achievement.
- Encourage the establishment or expansion of initiatives (including those involving public-private partnerships) that are designed to increase access to technology, particularly in schools served by “high need local educational agencies.”
- Work with WiscNet, Technology for Educational Achievement (TEACH) Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin system, Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and

Universities, the Wisconsin Technical College System, the Wisconsin Educational Communications Board, and elementary and secondary schools to assist in the statewide and local acquisition, development, interconnection, implementation, improvement, and maintenance of an effective educational technology infrastructure in a manner that expands access of technology to students (particularly disadvantaged students) and teachers.

Currently, providing each classroom with quality teachers and instruction is one initiative of the New Wisconsin Promise being implemented by the state superintendent. Technology plays an important part in this strand. Wisconsin's new PI 34 teacher licensure rules which take effect in 2004 set ten teacher standards, two of which require proficiency in Educational Technology. Colleges and universities that train teachers in Wisconsin are currently developing performance objectives with measurement instruments to ensure that all new teachers will meet all teachers standards including the use of instructional technology.

Starting in 1999-2000, districts began to use the Levels of Technology Implementation (LoTI) self-assessment tool to monitor educator's technology proficiency and its implementation into the curriculum. The use of LoTI was optional, but strongly encouraged by WDPI as a solid needs assessment for TLCF grants and for local technology planning efforts. About 41 percent of the 23,600 educators who took part in the initial round of data collection fell into the LoTI Level 2 - Exploration on the implementation scale, with 16 percent falling into Level 4 - Integration. The state's stated goal was to increase the number of existing teachers in Level 4. Results from 2000-2001 produced similar results for each of the levels. Each LoTI level, 0-6, has set criteria and rubrics that describe teaching practices and technology integration for the level. Each district that participated in the LoTI program received a report detailing its local condition with a list of methods to move teachers to the targeted minimum Level 4. WDPI staff received a statewide data set and a regional data set corresponding to the twelve CESAs in the state.

Currently, WDPI is assessing various other programs and assessment tools that measure the effectiveness of technology not only into the curriculum but also teacher proficiency and instructional practice. WDPI has been instrumental in the development of enGauge, a framework for examining the effectiveness of technology across six essential conditions (performance indicators) with each condition having 5-7 indicators (performance objectives). This tool uses a four part continuum of progress that ranges from awareness at the low end to transformation on the high end. Each part of the continuum has specific criteria for a placement. Wisconsin conducted two pilots using enGauge in 2001 and opened the process statewide in spring 2002. About 50 districts have participated in enGauge and WDPI will be analyzing results from the statewide data collected to monitor progress. There is a great deal of interest expressed by districts to participate in enGauge. It is both an online and onsite review of skills and program to integrate technology into curriculum.

Student standards and performance objectives for educational technology were identified in *Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Information and Technology Literacy* in 1998. Since then, the DPI has worked with districts to insert these standards in their curricula. Over 200 workshops were held and another book, *Information & Technology Literacy Standards Matrix*, was published in the year 2000 to assist districts in this process. The number of districts that have integrated the standards into each curricular area is monitored via DPI's annual district technology survey. Our most recent publication, *Information & Technology Literacy: A Collaborative Planning Guide for Library Media and Technology*, helps districts with implementation of the standards.

The state currently monitors access to educational technology and the extent to which it is integrated into the school curriculum on its annual, mandatory technology survey of public schools and districts. We will continue this process.

- b. *Provide a brief summary of the SEA's long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom, and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.*

In 1998, the WDPI published academic standards. *Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Information and Technology Literacy* were developed by a statewide task force of educators and representatives of other state agencies and businesses. This publication delineates what students should know and be able to do in the areas of information and technology literacy by the end of grades 4, 8, and 12.

To encourage the integration and implementation of these standards, another publication followed. *The Information and Technology Literacy: Standards Matrix* aligned the information and technology standards with standards in the four disciplines of science, math, social studies, and English language arts required to be assessed. This publication was accompanied by a CD-ROM with the Wisconsin academic standards in the assessed areas, the information and technology literacy standards, and several tools to be used by teams of curriculum planners as they develop a district's curriculum and lesson plans.

More than 100 workshops have been conducted around the state to assist educators in understanding the information and technology standards, how to correlate these standards with the assessed standards, and how to integrate these standards into curriculum. In the last two years the state required that 70 percent of money awarded under the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) grants be spent on professional development and the state spent an additional \$8 million dollars on professional development activities relating to educational technology. Two of the ten new standards for teacher licensure, under the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative (Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin Administrative Code, found on the web at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/pdf/pi34.pdf>) which go into effect in the year 2004, involve the use of educational technology.

In March 2002, *Information and Technology Literacy: A Collaborative Planning Guide for Library Media and Technology* was published. This publication encourages collaborative planning at the district and building levels so that library media specialists, instructional technology professionals, classroom teachers, and administrators work together for school improvement and greater student achievement. One combined program for library media and technology is recommended with better long-range planning as a focus. Again, the goal is improving student achievement.

In 1996, Wisconsin published a state educational technology plan. In 2000, the WDPI submitted an addendum to the plan and held workshops to assist districts with instructional technology planning. Most of the recommendations in the 1996 plan have been accomplished and WDPI is currently working on those in the 2000 addendum. This plan and the update include recommended levels of technology. School districts report their progress toward meeting these levels in the mandatory, annual district technology survey. There will be a new state educational technology plan developed over the next year to incorporate all of the federal requirements and to present a future vision for districts and the state in the use of educational technology.

The WDPI Instructional Media and Technology Team is very active in providing resources for teachers to use in the classroom for instruction, research and professional development. One of these tools is MarcoPolo: Internet Content for the Classroom. Wisconsin has received two WorldCom Foundation grants, one to assist in planning the educator training for all districts and all teachers. The other grant is to assist states in aligning MarcoPolo lessons and activities to Wisconsin's academic standards. This, too, is an effort to assist teachers in integrating technology into curriculum for student achievement. MarcoPolo information will be posted on WINSS (<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html>) for easy access by Wisconsin teachers.

Finally, the WDPI has been active in assessing success in implementing educational technology. The WDPI encouraged the use of the level of technology implementation teacher self-assessment instrument as a needs assessment measure two years ago. More than 23,000 teachers took that assessment in the state. Projects that used this measure are currently measuring progress. In collaboration with the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) and the CESAs, WDPI is currently providing school districts with an opportunity to discover the extent to which they are meeting six essential conditions that research has shown to be necessary for the effective use of educational technology (NCREL's enGauge process—see <http://www.ncrel.org/engauge>).

- c. *Describe key activities that the SEA will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the state level. These may include such activities as provision of distance learning in rigorous academic courses or curricula; the establishment or support of public-private initiatives for the acquisition of technology by high-need LEAs; and the development of performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of educational technology programs.*

Funds retained at the SEA under the former TLCF have been used to provide technical assistance to districts receiving the subgrants. The WDPI has also held grant writing workshops and focused on the districts that never applied for federal funding and assisted them in attending professional development activities. At an annual WDPI-sponsored TLCF conference, LEAs receiving funding present the outcomes of the use of those funds. Similar activities will be continued, as well as disseminating the new information about No Child Left Behind, Title II, Part D.

The WDPI will use some of the funds to create and maintain a statewide Ed Tech advisory committee to train grant reviewers, conduct the review process for the competitive portion, and monitor progress of the use of the formula and competitive grants. The WDPI will use the funds retained at the SEA to revise its state technology plan and incorporate all of the required elements into it. Some of the funding will need to be used to develop the evaluation and assessment system to determine the adequate yearly progress of subgrantees. At regional workshops the WDPI will assist LEAs receiving grants in all phases of their technology plan.

- d. *Provide a brief description of how –*

- i. *The SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology.*

One year ago (May 2001), 87 percent of Wisconsin's public school classrooms had at least one computer with Internet access. The percentage is expected to be higher this spring as a result of Wisconsin's making use of the following:

- State technology block grant program.
- Wiring loan program which requires only a 50 percent payback.

- Technology portion of the school renovation and repair grant which targets high-need districts.

In distributing the competitive portion of the Ed Tech grants, the WDPI will target those districts without access to educational technology. Additional points will be given to the competitive grant application with higher percentages of classrooms without Internet access in the high-need districts. As a stipulation for receiving funds, those districts will be required to acquire access.

In addition to planning for access, applicants will be required to explain how they intend to use the technology to increase student achievement and how they plan to measure results.

- ii. The SEA will coordinate the application and award process for state discretionary grant and formula grant funds under this program.*

Because of the low amount of money estimated for the formula portion of the Ed Tech grant, the WDPI anticipates that most LEAs will apply in consortia for both the formula and competitive grants in one application. The application process will include an option for LEAs to apply for the formula grant as part of their consolidated application and a separate application for the competitive grant. The consolidated application will have an option to allow the LEA to omit the Ed Tech grant in the consolidated application.

The required educational technology plan that LEAs must develop has already been reviewed and certified by the state and will accommodate not only the Ed Tech grants but the E-Rate program as well. Additional required information not included in current technology plans will be collected in the application process and folded into district technology plans before the next funding cycle.

The application itself will be evaluated through a process very similar to the one used for the TLCF program. LEAs applying for both parts of the funding will be evaluated based on the competitive criteria. These criteria will be developed, in part, by the Ed Tech advisory committee appointed by the state superintendent. The committee will be made up of educators representative of the stakeholder groups needed to make the statewide project successful. The evaluators will also be from the field and will be trained in the review process.

8. Title III, Part A—English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. Describe how the SEA will ensure that LEAs use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing LEAs flexibility (to the extent permitted under state law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that the grantees determine best reflects local needs and circumstances.*

Local application: Subgrantees shall prepare and submit a plan to carry out Title III activities that reflect local needs and circumstances as a part of the local consolidated plan and application. state law does not limit subgrantee flexibility. The WDPI will develop and provide guidance on Title III English language acquisition program development, based on scientifically-based program models, for limited English proficient (LEP) students with the following main components:

1. Local needs assessment in relation to LEP students, English language acquisition, academic achievement, professional development, parent and community involvement, etc. Subgrantees will provide baseline data to support the needs.
2. Measurable goals and objectives with clearly specified performance indicators for educational programs that result in showing adequate yearly progress as measured by state approved assessment tools.
3. Description of the proposed program design and how the design meets the requirements for scientifically-based and effective programs and activities for the education of LEP students.
4. Management plan to carry out program activities. Subgrantees will specify program activities authorized by Title III of the NCLB in relation to goals and objectives, timelines, and milestones in the management plan.
5. Administrative costs. Subgrantees may use not more than 2 percent of the funds for the cost of administering this subpart (SEC. 3115 of Title III).
6. Budget format. Subgrantee will use the state application form.
7. Each subgrantee will make assurances to comply with the entire act.

Parental Notification and Involvement

The LEA consolidated applications to be submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction contain two assurances that must be agreed to by eligible entities receiving Title III funds (page 3 of PI-9550, ESEA NCLB Act Consolidated Application):

(1) The local educational agency shall comply with the provisions of section 3302 related to parental notification prior to, and throughout, each school year.

(9) The local educational agency consulted with teachers, researchers, school administrators, and parents, and, if appropriate, with education-related community groups and nonprofit organizations, and institutions of higher education, in developing the local plan.

In addition, Descriptor H (page 9, PI-9550) requires that eligible entities describe how they will “implement effective parental and community participation and involvement” in the application narrative.

- b. *Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficient children, and making adequate yearly progress that raises the achievement of limited English proficient children.*

The department has drafted and is currently seeking feedback from LEAs on the following proposed measurable objectives for English Language Proficiency achievement by Title III-funded subgrantees.

The majority of English Language Learners (ELL) in Wisconsin will take seven years to progress from LEP language level 1 to fully-English proficient.

1. 80 percent of all language level 1 ELL students will progress by one (1.00) language level in one year.
2. 80 percent of all language levels 2 through 4 ELL students will progress by one-half (0.50) language level in one year.

3. 80 percent of all language level 5 ELL students will become fully-English proficient in two years.

Subgrantees will be responsible for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for LEP students, and making adequate yearly progress (AYP). This will occur as a part of the WDPI end-of-year reporting system, our accountability system and through WINSS.

Subgrantees will include the following components in an annual evaluation submitted to the WDPI:

4. Performance indicators for English language acquisition to reflect different levels of English proficiency. Subgrantee will provide a comparison of baseline data and annual test results to reflect adequate yearly progress with reference to levels of English proficiency.
 5. Performance indicators for academic achievement in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies as measured by the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) employing the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) and Alternate Performance Indicators (API) employing Measuring Essential Communication in the Content Areas (MECCA). Subgrantees will provide a comparison of baseline data and annual test results to reflect adequate yearly progress with reference to proficiency levels of academic achievement in content areas.
 6. A data gathering plan will be an integral part of grant applications. To ensure consistency in data requirements, the WDPI will provide a framework for data gathering and analysis. Workshops on data gathering and reporting will be conducted on a regional basis for all subgrantees.
- c. *Specify the percentage of the state's allotment that the state will reserve and the percentage of the reserved funds that the state will use for each of the following categories of state-level activities: professional development; planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination; technical assistance; and providing recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives. A total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the state's allotment may be reserved by the state under section 3111(b)(2) to carry out one or more of these categories of state-level activities.*
1. The WDPI will reserve 5 percent of the state's allocation or \$175,000 (whichever is greater) for the administration and statewide assistance related to this subpart as per section 3111(b)(2). DPI will reserve \$175,000 in 2002-03. The reservation will be used for the following categories of state-level activities:
 - Professional development: 30 percent
 - Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination: 42 percent
 - Technical assistance: 25 percent
 - Recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives: 3 percent
 2. The WDPI will allocate 95 percent of the remaining state allocation or \$2,616,423 on the basis of \$75 per LEP pupil. To meet the specified minimum grant award of \$10,000 an LEA would need 134 LEP/American Indian pupils. Approximately 40-45 districts will receive at least \$10,000. These districts can operate their own program or form a consortium with

others. Other local education agencies will have to form consortia with other LEAs or CESA agencies and combine their funds to meet the minimum grant requirement of \$10,000. Districts will also have the option of returning their allocation for redistribution.

In establishing the above formula, the department used data on LEP students reported by LEAs in 2001 and included 50 percent of all American Indian students in the state because this reflects the percentage of American Indian students performing below proficient and advanced on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations for Reading and English Language Arts.

3. Each subgrantee receiving funds under section 3114(a) of Title III of the NCLB may use not more than 2 percent of their funds for the cost of administering this subpart for each fiscal year.
- d. *Specify the percentage of the state's allotment that the state will reserve for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. A total amount not to exceed 15 percent of the state's allotment must be reserved by the state under section 3114(d)(1) to award this type of subgrant.*

The WDPI will reserve 5 percent of the remaining state allocation or \$137,706 for eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. Funds will be distributed based on a competitive application process.

- e. *Describe the process that the state will use in making subgrants under section 3114(d) to LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.*

The request for proposal (RFP) will be available through the WDPI's website for all eligible LEA applicants. A hard copy will be mailed to all eligible district administrators. Selection criteria consistent with federal guidelines and factors will be developed for this competition, including those eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth. Competitive and invitational priorities may be included as part of the selection criteria to ensure that grantees carry out one or more required and authorized activities at the LEA level. Grant reviewers will be selected and invited to attend an orientation session. The WDPI will award competitive grants to grantees based on points or scores.

- f. *Specify the number of limited English proficient children in the state. (See definitions of "child" in section 3301(1), and "limited English proficient" in section 9101(25).)*

The total number of LEP students in Wisconsin is 35,312. This figure includes 6,055 American Indian students.

- g. *Provide the most recent data available on the number of immigrant children and youth in the state. (See definition of "immigrant children and youth" in section 3301(6).)*
(Note: Section 3111 of the ESEA requires that state allocations for the Language Acquisition state grants be calculated on the basis of the number of limited English proficient children in the state compared to the number of such children in all states (80 percent) and the number of immigrant children and youth in the state compared to the number of such children and youth in all states (20 percent). The Department plans to use data from the 2000 Census to calculate state shares of limited English proficient students. However, these data on limited English proficient students will not be available for all states until September 2002. To ensure that states have access to funds as soon as they are available, the Department proposes, for FY 2002 only, to provide an initial distribution of 50 percent of the funds under the limited English proficient

portion of the formula based on state-reported data. As soon as Census data become available, the Department will recalculate and make final state allocations using 2000 Census data. For the 20 percent of formula funds distributed to states based on state shares of immigrant children and youth, the Department will use the most recent state-reported data year in allocating these funds. Census does not collect data that can be used to calculate state allocations for this part of the formula.)

The number of immigrant children and youth in Wisconsin is 6,855, per a count of Immigrant Children and Youth (form PI-2971) conducted in March and April 2002.

Supplemental Narrative on Title II Critical Requirements

Languages spoken in Wisconsin:

Per the March 2001 Census of Limited-English Proficient Students in Wisconsin, approximately 88% have either Spanish or Hmong as their first language (Spanish = 14,088; Hmong = 11,654, Total = 29,257).

Some of the larger language populations are:

- Albanian = 291;
- Arabic = 191;
- Khmer = 177;
- Korean = 208;
- Lao = 328;
- Mandarin = 182;
- Russian = 279;
- Serbian = 183;
- Urdu = 108; and
- Vietnamese = 121.

In addition, 6,055 American Indian students performing below state standards on WKCE in reading and English Language Arts qualify as LEP.

For a complete list of the numbers of LEP students by language, please see Attachment A.

Academic content assessment for LEP students

Assessment of LEP students in content areas: All students in Wisconsin, including LEP students with English proficiency at State-defined **levels 3, 4 and 5**, are required to take the Wisconsin's Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (**WKCE**) employing Terra Nova's standardized tests at grades 4, 8, and 10. School districts may test LEP students with state-defined English proficiency **levels 1 and 2** using WKCE if deemed valid or participate in state-define.

As part of the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (**WSAS**), the State standards-based Alternate Performance Indicators (**APIs**) are designed to measure academic achievement of English language learners in reading, English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies while they are in the early stages of English language acquisition, that is, at **levels 1 and 2** as measured by the State-approved assessment instruments: Language Assessment Scale (**LAS**), Idea Proficiency Test (**IPT**), Maculaitis Assessment of Competencies (**MAC II**), and Woodcock-Muñoz. The results of alternate assessment aligned to State standards through alternate performance indicators (**APIs**) in the content areas are reported as part of the annual **WSAS** data collection and analysis at grades 4, 8, and 10 in

reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies using the statewide academic language and concept rubric, Measuring Essential Communication in the Content Areas (MECCA).

With a few exceptions, school districts in Wisconsin provide content area instruction in English, not in a native language. Given the size and diversity of the LEP population, it is impractical and incongruent with best practices at this time for Wisconsin to develop and implement assessment instruments in a language other than English.

Clarification on Chapter PI 13 Wisconsin Administrative Code and standards-based assessment:

Wisconsin is currently revising PI 13 to comply with a Title I timeline waiver. The proposed revised Chapter PI 13 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code establishes procedures for the identification, assessment, and classification of limited-English proficient students. A bilingual-bicultural program as required by the state statute, s.115.97(1)-(5), Wis. Stats., means a program designed to improve the comprehension and the speaking, reading, and writing ability of a limited-English proficient pupil in the English language, so that the pupil will be able to perform ordinary classwork in English. A bilingual-bicultural program may be a basic program, as defined under s.115.955 (1), Wis. Stats., or an expanded program, as defined under s.115.955 (8), Wis. Stats.

Current PI 13.04 Programming provided for limited English proficient pupils.

(1) Each pupil participating in a bilingual-bicultural program shall be provided with a program appropriate for his or her needs; (2) The school district may include content and activities in the bilingual-bicultural program that reflect the cultural background of the limited-English proficient pupils and may include instruction intended to improve the skills of the pupils in the use of their native language for the purpose of enabling them to understand the instruction in reading, writing, and speaking the English language and other subjects; and, (3) Pupils enrolled in bilingual-bicultural education program shall have a full access to supportive services, such as language development, and speech therapy, available to other pupils in the school district.

Responses to the questions:

- Since 1977, all LEAs have been and will continue to be required to provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency including the 2002-2003 school year.
- The LEAs' annual assessment of English proficiency will include all domains of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension as measured by valid and reliable tests.
- The assessment of academic progress has been aligned with the State's academic content and academic achievement standards through: (1) alternate performance indicators (APIs) designed to measure students performance in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies based on State standards; and, (2) alignment of all five (5) levels of English proficiency as per State administrative rule (PI 13) and test results as measured by LAS, IPT, MAC II, and Woodcock-Muñoz. In response to No Child Left Behind, the department is in the process of developing a federal grant proposal for submission to the U.S. Department of Education. This proposal, if funded, will make it possible for Wisconsin to develop standards-based English proficiency assessment instruments directly linked to district curriculum and instruction. Eventually, the new instruments would replace LAS, IPT, MAC II, and Woodcock-Muñoz in assessing limited English language proficiency. A framework for this proposal can be found in Appendix A of Wisconsin's Consolidated State Application.
- Current assessment practice: Districts use commercial tests (LAS, IPT, MAC II, or Woodcock-Muñoz) to determine English proficiency, and alternate assessment (APIs and MECCA) for

academic progress of beginning level students (levels 1-2). All other LEP students (levels 3-5) take WKCE employing Terra Nova tests with or without accommodations as appropriate.

State academic standards and measurable objectives for LEP students

The status of the state efforts to establish standards: State academic and performance standards are the same for all students including LEP students. All LEP students are required to take either an alternate assessment using alternate performance indicators, or Wisconsin's WKCE (employing Terra Nova standardized tests) based on rigorous State academic standards. The ultimate goal is to ensure that all LEP students perform at or above the proficient level in content areas within 5 to 7 years as confirmed by recent research findings. There are no separate standards for LEP students.

Development and attainment of English proficiency: Both state statute (s.115.96(1), Wis. Stats.) and administrative rule (PI 13) require school districts to assess English proficiency and literacy skills of LEP students as measured by valid and reliable language assessment instruments (LAS, IPT, MAC II, and Woodcock-Muñoz). English language development programs such as content-based ESL are required to facilitate the development and attainment of English proficiency. All Wisconsin school districts are required to report annually how many students moved up one or more proficiency levels or were reclassified as fully English proficient. In addition, the alternate assessment through MECCA are required to measure reading in English and language arts for LEP students. The assessment requirement makes it necessary for school districts to provide instructional programs and services designed to improve English proficiency and literacy skills for LEP students.

Measurable objectives for LEP students: The department has drafted and is currently seeking feedback from LEAs on the following proposed measurable objectives for English Language Proficiency achievement by Title III-funded subgrantees.

The majority of LEP students in Wisconsin will take seven years to progress from LEP language level 1 to fully-English proficient (language level 6).

1. 80% of all language level 1 LEP students will progress by one (1.00) language level in one year.
2. 80% of all language levels 2 through 4 LEP students will progress by one-half (0.50) language level in one year.
3. 80% of all language level 5 LEP students will become fully-English proficient in two years.

Subgrantees, with support from the department, will be responsible for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for LEP students.

March 2001 Census of Limited-English Proficient Pupils in Wisconsin by Language

<i>Language</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Language</i>	<i>Total</i>
Afrikaans	13	Malay	2
Albanian	291	Malayalam	4
American Sign Language	21	Mandarin	182
Amharic	3	Marshallese	8
Arabic	191	Multiple	28
Armenian	6	Nepali	12
Bengali	13	Norwegian	6
Bosnian	36	Not on List	99
Bulgarian	25	Other African	19
Cantonese	79	Other American Indian	1
Cebuano	1	Other Chinese	54
Creole or Patois	1	Other South Asian	12
Croatian	28	Polish	48
Czech	3	Portugese	45
Danish	3	Punjabi	97
Dutch	11	Quechua	2
Estonian	2	Rumanian	26
Farsi	28	Russian	279
Finnish	8	Rwanda (Kinyarwanda)	7
French	36	Samoan	5
Gaelic(Irish)	1	Serbian	183
German	55	Serbo-Croatian	55
Greek	25	Sinhalese	2
Gujarati	34	Slovak	2
Hausa	1	Somali	34
Hebrew	5	Spanish	14,088
Hindi	69	Sudanese Arabic	3
Hmong	11,654	Swahili	4
Hungarian	8	Swedish	5
Ibo	3	Tagalog (Pilipino, Filipino)	56
Indonesian	4	Taiwanese	10
Italian	16	Tamil	8
Japanese	48	Telugu	13
Kannada	3	Thai	20
Khmer	177	Tibetan	65
Khmu	1	Tigrinya	1
Korean	208	Truk	6
Kurdi	13	Turkish	23
Lao	328	Ukrainian	26
Latvian	5	Urdu	108
Lithuanian	6	Vietnamese	121
Macedonian	21	Western Caribbean Creole	2
Malagasy	1	Yoruba	1
		<i>Total for all Languages</i>	<i>29,257</i>

In addition, 6,055 American Indian students performing below state standards on WKCE in reading and English Language Arts qualify as LEP.

9. Title IV, Part A—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities [Goal 4]

- a. *Describe the key strategies in the state's comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the SEA and the Governor to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that –*
 - i. *Complement and support activities of LEAs under section 4115(b) of the ESEA;*
 - ii. *Comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a); and*
 - iii. *Otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of Title IV, Part A.*
(Note: The reauthorized provisions of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) Program clearly emphasize well-coordinated SEA and Governors Program activities. The statute requires that significant parts of the program application be developed for each state's program, not for the SEA and Governors Programs individually. For this reason, each state must submit a single application for SDFSC SEA and Governors Program funds. states may choose to apply for SDFSC funding through this consolidated application or through a program-specific application.)

The following are key strategies in Wisconsin's plan for use of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program funds. All of the following are supported by WDPI, the governor's representative, and the WDHFS.

- Use of programs and strategies based on scientific research. The WDPI and WDHFS will collect and disseminate information on scientific research related to drug and violence prevention. They will encourage the use of research-based programs and strategies through grant priorities, guidance documents and sharing examples of research-based practice. One example of this will include adding prevention research-based strategies to the WINSS system.
- Professional development for school and community staff. The WDPI and WDHFS will support a wide variety of professional development activities for school and community staff related to drug and violence prevention. These will include conferences, workshops, and information dissemination via the Internet.
- Public policy advancement related to tobacco, alcohol and other drug issues. The WDPI and WDHFS will support state and local policies to enhance drug and violence prevention. For example, in the area of tobacco policies, both agencies will support efforts to develop and enforce policies to limit youth access to tobacco and strengthen smoke-free environments.
- Promoting flexible use of various funding sources to achieve prevention goals. The WDHFS and WDPI will encourage the use of categorical funding sources in flexible, but appropriate, ways to help accomplish prevention goals. For example the WDHFS will facilitate the State Incentive Grant plan to enhance coordination of community AODA funding and services.
- Youth leadership for drug and violence prevention. The WDHFS and WDPI will support activities to strengthen youth leadership for drug and violence prevention. For example, the WDPI will support leadership development conferences for student athletes who will lead drug prevention activities.

- Community education and coalition building to include parents and community involvement in drug and violence prevention. The WDHFS and WDPI will support community and parent involvement in drug and violence prevention programs. Examples include the requirements for local community collaboration in school drug and violence programs administered by the WDPI and the development and dissemination of guidance documents and tools to assist with community involvement in school-based prevention programs.
- Monitoring and surveillance of youth risk behaviors. The WDPI and WDHFS will implement statewide surveillance projects to measure drug and violence behaviors. One current example of this effort is the Youth Risk Behavior Survey conducted every two years by WDPI.
- Cross-agency cooperation to support common goals. The WDHFS and WDPI will continue to work together across agencies and with other agencies towards common prevention goals. Current examples of collaborative efforts are the State Council on AODA and its committees and the various youth tobacco programs funded by the Wisconsin Tobacco Control Board.

Together these strategies and activities will help ensure that coordinated efforts are made to meet state goals regarding drug and violence prevention.

- b. *Describe the state's performance measures for drug and violence prevention programs and activities to be funded under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1. These performance measures must focus on student behaviors and attitudes. They must consist of performance indicators for drug and violence prevention programs and activities and levels of performance for each performance indicator. The description must also include timelines for achieving the performance goals stated, details about what mechanism the state will use to collect data concerning the indicators, and provide baseline data for indicators (if available).*

Wisconsin establishes the following performance indicators for drug and violence prevention programs and activities to be funded under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1.

Performance Indicator 1: The percentage of students who carried a weapon (for example, a gun, knife, or club) on school property (in the 30 days prior to the survey).

Performance Indicator 2: The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey).

Performance Indicator 3: The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey).

Performance Indicator 4: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the state.

These will be measured by the Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey in 2003 and every two years subsequently for students in grades 9–12. The 2001 YRBS data reveal the following results which may be considered baseline. In addition, the Department of Public Instruction will record the number of persistently dangerous schools identified in the state.

Performance Indicator 1: The percentage of students who carried a weapon (for example, a gun, knife, or club) on school property (in the 30 days prior to the survey). *2001 result:* 3 percent

Performance Indicator: The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey). *2001 result:* 11 percent

Performance Indicator: The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey). *2001 result:* 27 percent

Consistent with other parts of this application, Wisconsin performance targets, including timelines for achieving them, will be set and reported to USDE by May 2003.

- c. *Describe the steps the state will use to implement the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) required by section 4112(c)(3). The description should include information about which agency(ies) will be responsible for implementing the UMIRS, a tentative schedule for implementing the UMIRS requirements, as well as preliminary plans for collecting required information.*

Wisconsin will undertake the following actions to implement the required Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. The information system comprises three components each described below.

WDPI will continue to implement the School Performance Report data collection system for: habitual truancy and suspensions and expulsions related to violent and drug-related offenses in elementary and secondary schools. This data is collected annually from all school districts. The schedule includes: new instructions will be disseminated in September 2002; data collected beginning June 2003; data analysis from September 2003 through March 2004.

WDPI will continue to implement the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities End of Year reporting system. This will contain the types of curricula, programs and services provided by the WDPI and LEAs receiving funds under this program. The Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services will expand this reporting system in 2002-2003 to include their sub-grantees. The schedule includes: new instructions will be disseminated in September 2002; data collected beginning June 2003; data analysis from September 2003 through March 2004.

WDPI, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the University of Wisconsin-Madison Comprehensive Cancer Center, and the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services, will continue to implement the Wisconsin Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) to collect data on alcohol, tobacco, other drug use, violence and related risk behaviors. This will continue to include incidence, prevalence, and age of onset among high school students. The 2003 Wisconsin YRBS will be enhanced to include questions on perceived health risk and social disapproval of drug use and violence. The schedule includes: revisions to survey instrument will be developed in September 2002; data collected beginning March 2003; data analysis from June 2003 through March 2004.

10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, section 4112(a)—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor [Goal 4]

- a. *The Governor may reserve up to 20 percent of the state's allocation under this program to award competitive grants or contracts. Indicate the percentage of the state's allocation that is to be reserved for the Governor's program.*

Wisconsin will reserve 20 percent of this allocation for the governor's designee.

- b. The Governor may administer these funds directly or designate an appropriate state agency to receive the funds and administer this allocation. Provide the name of the entity designated to receive these funds, contact information for that entity (the name of the head of the designated agency, address, telephone number) and the "DUNS" number that should be used to award these funds.*

Governor designee:

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services
Secretary Phyllis Dubé
1 West Wilson Street, Room 650
Madison, WI 53702
608-266-9622

DUNS #: 081124096

The Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services proposes to utilize the funds in the following manner for 2002-03.

Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act – Governor’s Portion					
Program Name	Budget	Grant Type (Competitive, Formula, Interagency, Purchase of Service)	Obligation Period	Grantee or Contract Area	Description/Comments
Prevention Resource Center	\$390,000	Interagency (State Direct Service)	01/01/2003 - 12/31/2003	UW-Madison Univ. Health Services	Provide technical assistance and information to prevention program providers to build statewide capacity for effective programming.
Teen Institute	\$200,000	Interagency (State Direct Service)	1/1/2003 - 12/31/2003	UW-Eau Claire Arts and Science Outreach	Develop 6 Annual Teen Institutes to develop youth leadership in providing prevention services and along with adults develop community plan for services.
Inner City Prevention Program	\$228,648	Formula (Only 4 Inner- City Program in Wisconsin)	1/1/2003 - 12/31/2003	Kenosha County Racine County Rock County Dane County	Provide substance abuse prevention services to inner-city youth. DFS prevention dollars are added to state/county contract addendum along with SAPTBG funds and managed by DSL under one application for each of 4 inner-city councils in the communities of B
High Risk Youth Tribal Prevention	\$140,844	Formula (Split among the states 11 Native American Indian Tribes)	10/1/2002 - 09/30/2003	Split among 11 Tribal Reservations	Funds are part of Tribal Consolidation Plan and are used to provide substance abuse prevention services to Tribal Indians. Funds are provided to the Tribes through OSF and managed by the Tribal Affairs Coordinators Office.
Safe and Stable Families (SS/F)	\$256,596	Formula (Funds used to supplement SS/F Program in all 72 counties and 11 Tribes)	01/01/2003 - 09/30/2003	Split among 72 Counties 11 Tribes	Funds are used to supplement statewide Family Preservation/Family Support Project and are targeted towards youth and substance abuse prevention services
Alliance/Law Enforcement Partnership Program	\$144,306	Competitive RFP	01/01/2003 - 12/31/2003	Law Enforcement Activities through the Alliance for Wisconsin Youth	The Dept. is required to use at least 10 percent of its DFS dollars for law enforcement partnership programs. Current funds are distributed through the Alliance for Wisconsin Youth.
Consultation, program operations and program development	\$39,077	Purchase of Service Contract	10/1/2002 - 9/30/2004	Sundry Vendors	Funds to support the development, design, technical assistance, and training. This includes building capacity for local program evaluation, need assessment, implementation of best practices, and addressing one-time special program implementation needs.
Administration	\$43,592	Internal Admin.	7/1/2002 - 9/30/2004	Administration	Funds used to support state administrative services.
TOTAL	\$1,443,063				

11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, section 4126—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants [Goal 4]

Describe how the SEA, after it has consulted with the Governor, will use program funds to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students.

Pending additional federal guidance on this new ESEA program, WDPI proposes to make available a competitive grant program to LEAs for this purpose. LEAs would be encouraged to partner with community-based organizations to create or expand such programs to help all students achieve high standards.

12. Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers [Goals 1, 2, and 5]

Identify the percentage of students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics. The state must collect baseline data for the 2002-2003 school year, and submit all of these data to the Department no later than early September of 2003 by a date the Department will announce.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction will collect baseline data for the 2002-2003 school year to address the above provision, and will submit all of these data to the Department no later than early September of 2003 by a date the Department will announce.

13. Title V, Part A—Innovative Programs [Any goal(s) selected by State]

a. *In accordance with section 5112(a)(1) of the ESEA, provide the SEA's formula for distributing program funds to LEAs. Include information on how the SEA will adjust its formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child, such as –*

- i. *Children living in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families;*
- ii. *Children from economically disadvantaged families; and*
- iii. *Children living in sparsely populated areas.*

In compliance with section 5112 (a)(1), the department will distribute 85 percent of the Title V allocation to LEAs for fiscal year 2002 using the formula described below. If in succeeding years, the state's Title V allocation increases, the department will distribute 100 percent of the increased funds to LEAs via the formula.

The department will allocate Title V funds to LEAs under the same formula that it used for Title VI Innovative Education Program Strategies during the 1994 Reauthorization period. The formula for distributing program funds to LEAs will be as follows:

- 42 percent on the total public and private school enrollment.
- 58 percent on the number of low-income (formula) children used to allocate Title I funds.

The enrollment is based on the number of K-12 public and private school students age 5-17 enrolled in public school districts and private schools which participate in the Title V program.

To comply with section 5112 (c)(3), the department will adjust the formula by using criteria that identify children from low-income families (referred to here as Title I formula children).

The low-income factor is determined by using the total number of Title I formula children in each school district. To be eligible for funds under this factor of the formula, the number of Title I formula children in a school district must equal 5 percent or more of the total school enrollment. Under these criteria, 76 percent of the school districts would be eligible. To determine the per-pupil, high-cost allotment the total amount of available low-income funds is divided by the number of Title I formula children in eligible school districts.

This formula adheres to the requirement of distributing a portion of the funds for school enrollment and adjusts the allocation to provide higher per pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest number of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child.

- b. Identify the amount or percentage the state will reserve for each state-level activity under section 5121, and describe the activity.*

The state will retain \$1,090,095 of the 2002 Title V appropriation for state level activities. Up to \$163,514 (15% of \$1,090,095) will be used for program administration which includes the following activities which are specified under section 5121(1): (A) allocating funds to local educational agencies; (B) planning, supervising, and processing state educational agency funds; and (C) monitoring and evaluating Title V programs/activities.

The remaining state set-aside funds of \$926,581 will be used for activities that support section 5121(3), (4), and (5). Approximately 50 percent of the \$926,581 will be used for section 5121 (3) which include statewide education reform, school improvement programs and technical assistance activities which assist LEAs with implementing the Innovative Education Programs under s. 5131. Primarily these activities will focus on, but will not be limited to, the following: technology education programs, instructional and educational materials programs, promising educational reform projects, community service programs, parent and community involvement programs, and service learning programs.

The remaining funds (approximately 50%) will be used for state level activities that support the design and implementation of high-quality yearly student assessments [section 5121(4)] and support the implementation of challenging state and local academic achievement standards [section 5121(5)]. Activities may include training, workshops, technical assistance and materials and publications for LEAs. To the extent possible, the above mentioned activities under section 5121(3), (4), and (5) will be coordinated with the state superintendent's New Wisconsin Promise Initiatives.

14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111—State Assessments Formula Grants [Goals 1,2,3,5]

Describe how the state plans to use formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of state assessments in accordance with section 6111(1) and (2).

[See page 67, item 3(1) (e)].

15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2—Rural and Low-Income School Program [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. Identify the SEA's specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement; decreasing student dropout rates; or improvement in other educational*

factors the SEA may elect to measure, and describe how Rural and Low-Income School program funds will help the SEA meet the goals and objectives identified.

The WDPI's measurable goal for use of Title VI-B (2) funds is for LEAs to demonstrate an increase in student achievement in either reading or mathematics for each year of funding. LEAs will file an application with WDPI that includes measurable objectives, performance indicators, activities, and evaluation tools defining how the use of funds is related to increased student achievement in reading and/or mathematics. LEAs will use both state and local assessment data to measure student achievement. The SEA will collect data on both use of funds and student achievement as reported by the LEAs. These goals and objectives are consistent with the key strategic priorities of the New Wisconsin Promise.

b. *Describe how the state elects to make awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program:*

- i. *By formula proportionate to the numbers of students in eligible districts;*
- ii. *Competitively (please explain any priorities for the competition); or*
- iii. *By a state-designed formula that results in equal or greater assistance being awarded to school districts that serve higher concentrations of poor students.*
(NOTE: If a state elects this option, the formula must be submitted for the Department's approval. states that elect this option may submit their state-designed formulas for approval as part of this submission.)

WDPI will be making awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program by using a formula proportionate to the number of students in eligible, participating districts.

GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427

All applicants for new awards must include information in their applications to address GEPA, Section 427 in order to receive funding under this program. GEPA 427 requires a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted programs for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. For a state-formula grant program, a state needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for state-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the state for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the state for funding. The state would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 to the state.

For further information about GEPA 427 and how to satisfy the requirement of this provision, please see "Notice to All Applicants" found at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/gepa.html>.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is strongly committed to the provision of equitable educational opportunities for all students, teachers, and program beneficiaries and will:

- **Take steps to ensure equitable access to and equitable participation** in any project or activity conducted with federal assistance. This includes leaders and administrators use of a planned and systemic method for taking into account the need for greater access to, and participation in, programs by students from historically underserved groups including: females, minorities, individuals with limited English proficiency, the economically disadvantaged, and individuals with disabilities. Equity and access issues are critical as well to technology infusion in all ESEA plans and covered programs.

- **Overcome barriers by addressing the special needs** of students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries, on the basis of gender, race, national origin (includes limited English proficiency), color, disability and/or age. This includes using funds from the ESEA (or other sources) to promote educational equity knowledge, skills and dispositions, through professional development, program planning, implementation, and evaluation.
- **Assist all students, including historically underrepresented or underserved populations, to meet the same rigorous standards** for academic performance expected of all children and youth. This includes assisting students to meet the challenging state content and performance standards in the core content areas. and schools and staff meeting the culturally-related education needs of students. This mission is reflected in the “New Wisconsin Promise” referenced elsewhere in this plan.

See http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dltcl/eis/pdf/dpi2001_85.pdf

Part A: Wisconsin’s Goal

To infuse and include at the state level and to support local infusion and inclusion of educational equity into each ESEA project or activity by addressing the special needs of students, teachers and other program beneficiaries in order to overcome barriers to equitable participation and equitable achievement, including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability and age as well as other protected categories under s.118.13, Wis. Stats.

Subgoals

1. *Within the Department of Public Instruction (state level):*
 - a. To ensure that funds reserved for state level uses, under the covered programs, other than administrative costs, will provide for equitable access to, and participation in, state directed activities (e.g., workshops, conferences and publications) for students, teachers and other beneficiaries.
2. *Within the department and through collaboration with and support of local programs and activities:*
 - a. To continue to promote equity of access to rigorous curriculum in all core subject areas for all students. (access)
 - b. To assist local educators in developing and delivering equitable and inclusive curriculum. This includes scientifically-based, equitable, and inclusive materials, instruction and model programs and extracurricular activities.
 - c. To assist local educators to utilize equitable instructional methods, strategies, practices, and appropriate support services to promote equitable achievement for all students.
 - d. To assist local educators to establish assessment processes that ensure systematic evaluations of each student’s progress and needs with respect to ensuring an equitable opportunity for each to learn, achieve and succeed.
 - e. To assist local educators to establish equitable, safe, and conducive school environments, including diversity in staffing patterns, diversity in community and parental involvement and universality in student codes of conduct that support respect and equitable achievement for all students.

- f. To advance educators' abilities to create systemic reform and change that supports multicultural understanding, educational equity and respect for diversity. in: the school environment, the curriculum, instructional methods and practices, staffing patterns, community and parental involvement, and student codes of conduct. This will happen, in part, through our quality teachers initiative or PI 34. See <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/tel/watsnew.html>

Part B: Implementation

Within the Department of Public Instruction (state level):

Staff from the department's Equity Mission Team and staff representing each of the covered programs in this plan will jointly be responsible for implementing activities designed to address the educational equity goals above.

Within the department and through collaboration with and support of local programs and activities:

With regard to **access**, the agency administers a state pupil nondiscrimination statute covering all students by 14 protected group categories. Local school districts receive technical assistance to conduct a self-evaluation once every five years as well as to develop or improve policies and complaint procedures to implement the statute locally. In addition, the department provides technical assistance and compliance activities under special education and federal civil rights requirements. Districts have been asked to include their self-evaluation results in the needs assessment and local plan for ESEA funds.

See <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/equity/pupintro.html>

With regard to **curriculum and instruction** issues, the SEA publishes curriculum guides in the content areas, each of which includes ideas and tools to achieve equity. Content area consultants provide technical assistance on best practices in curriculum and instruction.

With regard to **school environment** and **staff development** issues the WDPI has coordinated and supported model programs such as A World Of Difference (AWOD); Gender/Ethnic Expectations and Student Achievement (GESA); Equity Principal; Participating Parents for Progress (PPP); Facing the Future and Ourselves; and Respecting Ethnic and Cultural Heritage (REACH) in addition to developing our own programs and publications.

For more information visit the Equity Mission Team home page at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/equity/index.html>

Consolidated Administrative Funds

1. *Does the SEA plan to consolidate state-level administrative funds?*
If yes, please provide information and analysis concerning Federal and other funding that demonstrates that Federal funds constitute less than half of the funds used to support the SEA.
If yes, are there any programs whose funds are available for administration that the SEA will not consolidate?

WDPI cannot demonstrate that the majority of its resources are derived from non-federal sources, so is not eligible to consolidate administrative funds.

2. *Please describe your plans for any additional uses of funds.*

Transferability

Does the state plan to transfer non-administrative state-level ESEA funds under the provisions of the state and Local Transferability Act (sections 6121 to 6123 of the ESEA)? If so, please list the funds and the amounts and percentages to be transferred, the program from which funds are to be transferred, and the program into which funds are to be transferred.

(Note: If the state elects to notify the Department of the transfer in this document, the state's responses to the application's requests for information should reflect the state's comprehensive plan after the transfer. If the state has not elected to transfer funds at this time, it may do so at a later date. To do so, the state must (1) establish an effective date for the transfer, (2) notify the Department (at least 30 days before the effective date of the transfer) of its intention to transfer funds, and (3) submit the resulting changes to the information previously submitted in the state's consolidated application by 30 days after the effective date of the transfer.)

The WDPI appreciates the flexibility provided to transfer funds under this provision. The WDPI does not plan to transfer funds at this time but reserves the right to do so in the future and will notify the USDE at least 30 days before the effective transfer.

Assurances and Certifications

Instructions:

*The Consolidated State Application Signature Page, signed by the authorized state/SEA representative and **submitted in June 2002**, certifies the state's agreement to the following sets of assurances, the crosscutting certification, and the requirements of GEPA, Section 427.*

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, with the submission of this application, certifies to the following set of general and cross-cutting assurances and requirements:

General and Cross-Cutting Assurances

Description: Section 9304(a) requires states to have on file with the Secretary a single set of assurances, applicable to each program included in the consolidated application, that provide that—

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;
2. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
3. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;
4. The state will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including—
 - a. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
 - b. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
 - c. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;
5. The state will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;
6. The state will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the state under each such program;
7. The state will—
 - a. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
 - b. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and
 - c. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the state afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.

- d. The State of Wisconsin agrees that in determining the amount of any FY 2002 and subsequent fiscal year MEP subgrants it will award to local educational agencies, it will take into account the following funding factors: 1) the numbers of migratory children; 2) the needs of migratory children; 3) the service priority under subsection 1304 (d); and the availability of funds from other programs. Furthermore, the State recognizes that a condition will be attached to the grant award requiring it to submit to the Department, by September 1, 2002, a detailed description of how these factors will be used in the State's determination of its FY 2002 and subsequent FY MEP subgrants (including weights to be assigned to individual factors).

Certification

Certification of compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements

The state certifies that it has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the state (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by state law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to attend safe public elementary or secondary schools within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.

ESEA Program Specific Assurances

Each SEA that submits a consolidated application also must provide an assurance that it will comply with all requirements of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications, whether or not the program statute identifies these requirements as a description or assurance that states would address, absent this consolidated application, in a program-specific plan or application. States are required to maintain records of their compliance with each of those requirements. (Note: For the Safe and Drug Free Schools programs, the SEA must have all appropriate assurances from the Governor on record.)

Through the general assurance and assurance (1) in section 9304 (a), the SEA agrees to comply with all requirements of the ESEA and other applicable program statutes. While all requirements are important, we have identified below a number of key requirements of each program that the SEA is agreeing to meet through this general assurance. This list of program-specific requirements the SEA is assuring is not exhaustive; states are accountable for all program requirements.

1. Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs

Assurance that –

- a. The state plan for the implementation of Title I, Part A was developed in consultation with LEAs, teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff and parents and that the plan for Title I, Part A coordinates with other programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- b. The SEA has a plan for assisting LEAs and schools to develop capacity to comply with program operation and for providing additional educational assistance to students needing help to achieve state standards, including:
 - i. the use of schoolwide programs;

- ii. steps to ensure that both schoolwide program- and targeted assisted program schools have highly qualified staff (section 1111);
 - iii. ensuring that assessments results are used by LEAs, schools, and teachers to improve achievement (section 1111);
 - iv. use of curricula aligned with state standards (section 1111);
 - v. provision of supplemental services, including a list of approved service providers and standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services (section 1116);
 - vi. choice and options (section 1116);
 - vii. the state support system under section 1117; and
 - viii. teacher and paraprofessional qualifications (section 1119).
- c. The state has a strategy for ensuring that children served by Title I, Part A will be taught the same knowledge and skills in other subjects and held to the same expectations as all children.
 - d. The state will implement the accountability requirements of section 1116(f) regarding schools identified for improvement prior to the passage of NCLB.
 - e. The state will implement the provisions of section 1116 regarding LEAs and schools in improvement and corrective action.
 - f. The state will produce and disseminate an annual State Report Card in accordance with section 1111(h)(1) and will ensure that LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds produce and disseminate annual local Report Cards in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
 - g. The SEA will ensure that LEAs will annually assess English skills for all limited-English proficient students.
 - h. The SEA will coordinate with other agencies that provide services to children, youth and families to address factors that have significantly affected the achievement of students.
 - i. The SEA will ensure that assessment results are promptly provided to LEAs, schools, and teachers.
 - j. The state will participate in state academic assessments of 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics under NAEP if the Secretary pays the cost of administering such assessments, and will ensure that schools drawn for the NAEP sample will participate in all phases of these assessments, including having results published.
 - k. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, will produce a plan for carrying out the responsibilities of the state under sections 1116 and 1117, and the SEA's statewide system for technical assistance and support of LEAs.
 - l. The SEA will assist LEAs in developing or identifying high-quality curricula aligned with state academic achievement standards and will disseminate such curricula to each LEA and local school within the state.
 - m. The state will carry out the assurances specified in section 1111(c).

2. Title I, Part B—Even Start Family Literacy

Assurance that—

- a. The SEA will meet its indicators of program quality developed in section 1240.
- b. The SEA will help each project under this part to fully implement the program elements described in section 1235, including the monitoring of the projects' compliance with staff qualification requirements and usage of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research for children and adults.
- c. The SEA collaborated with early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, and others at the state and local level with interests in family literacy in the development and implementation of this plan.

3. Title I, Part C—Education of Migrant Children

Assurance that—

In addition to meeting the seven program assurances in Section 1304(c), the SEA will ensure that—

- a. Special educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children, are identified and addressed through—(a) the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, state, and federal educational programs; (b) joint planning among local, state, and federal educational programs serving migrant children, including language instruction educational programs under part A or B of title III; and (c) the integration of services available under this part with services provided by those other programs, a (d) measurable program goals and outcomes.
- b. State and its local operating agencies will identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children in accordance with a comprehensive state plan as specified in section 1306 (a).
- c. State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records in a manner consistent with procedures the Secretary may require.
- d. The State of Wisconsin agrees that in determining the amount of any FY 2002 and subsequent fiscal year MEP subgrants it will award to local educational agencies, it will take into account the following funding factors: 1) the numbers of migratory children; 2) the needs of migratory children; 3) the service priority under subsection 1304 (d); and the availability of funds from other programs. Furthermore, the State recognizes that a condition will be attached to the grant award requiring it to submit to the Department, by September 1, 2002, a detailed description of how these factors will be used in the State's determination of its FY 2002 and subsequent FY MEP subgrants (including weights to be assigned to individual factors).

4. Title I, Part D—Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk

Assurance that the SEA—

- a. Will ensure that programs will be carried out in accordance with the state plan.
- b. Will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 1431.

- c. Has collaborated with parents, correctional facilities, local education agencies, public and private business and other state and federal technical and vocational programs in developing and implementing its plan to meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.
- d. Conducts a process to award Subpart 2 subgrants, to programs operated by local education agencies and correctional facilities.
- e. Will integrate programs and services for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth with other programs under this Act or other Acts.

5. Title I, Part F—Comprehensive School Reform

Assurance that the SEA will—

- a. Fulfill all requirements relating to the competitive subgranting of program funds.
- b. Awards subgrants of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support the initial costs of the program.
- c. Award subgrants renewable for 2 additional one year periods if the school is making substantial progress.
- d. Consider the equitable distribution of subgrants to different geographic regions in the state, including urban and rural areas and to schools serving elementary and secondary students.
- e. Reserve not more than five (5) percent of grant funds for administrative, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.
- f. Use funds to supplement, and not supplant, any other funds that would otherwise be available to carry out these activities.
- g. Report subgrant information, including names of LEAs and schools, amount of award, and description of award.
- h. Provide a copy of the state's annual program evaluation.

6. Title II, Part A—Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

Assurance that—

- a. The SEA will take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements for “professional development” as the term is defined in section 9101(34).
- b. All funded activities will be developed collaboratively and based on the input of teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.
- c. The SEA will implement the provisions for technical assistance and accountability in section 2141 with regard to any LEA that has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.

7. Title II, Part D—Enhanced Education Through Technology

Assurance that the SEA—

- a. Will ensure that each subgrant awarded under section 2412 (a)(2)(B) is of sufficient size and duration, and that the program funded by the subgrant is of sufficient scope and quality, to carry out the purposes of this part effectively.
- b. Has in place a State Plan for Educational Technology that meets all of the provisions of section 2413 of ESEA.

8. Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

Assurance that—

- a. Subgrantees will be required to use their subgrants to build their capacity to continue to provide high-quality language instruction educational programs for LEP students once the subgrants are no longer available.
- b. The state will consult with LEAs, education-related community groups and non-profit organizations, parents, teachers, school administrators, and researchers in developing annual measurable student achievement objectives for subgrantees.
- c. Each subgrantee will include in its plan a certification that all teachers in a Title III language instruction educational program for limited English proficient children are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction.
- d. In awarding subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a recent significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant students, the state will equally consider eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth, and consider the quality of each local plan.
- e. Subgrants will be of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality programs.
- f. Subgrantees will be required to provide for an annual reading or language arts assessment in English of all children who have been in the United States for three or more consecutive years.
- g. Subgrantees will be required to assess annually the English proficiency of all LEP children.
- h. A subgrantee plan will not be in violation of any state law, including state constitutional law, regarding the education of LEP children.
- i. Subgrantee evaluations will be used to determine and improve the effectiveness of subgrantee programs and activities.
- j. Subgrantee evaluations will include a description of the progress made by children in meeting state academic content and student academic achievement standards for each of the two years after these children no longer participate in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- k. A subgrantee that fails to make progress toward meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years will be required to develop an improvement plan that will ensure the subgrantee meets those objectives.
- l. Subgrantees will be required to provide the following information to parents of LEP children selected for participation in a language instruction educational program:

- 1) How the program will meet the educational needs of their children;
 - 2) Their options to decline to enroll their children in that program or to choose another program, if available;
 - 3) If applicable, the failure of the subgrantee to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for their children.
- m. In awarding subgrants, the state will address the needs of school systems of all sizes and in all geographic areas within the state, including school systems with urban and rural schools.

9. Title IV, Part A—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Assurance that—

- a. The state has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the state educational agency and the chief executive officer of the state to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support activities of local educational agencies under section 4115(b), that comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a), and that otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of this part.
- b. Activities funded under this program will foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- c. The application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate state officials and others, including the chief executive officer, the chief state school officer, the head of the state alcohol and drug abuse agency, the heads of the state health and mental health agencies, the head of the state child welfare agency, the head of the state board of education, or their designees, and representatives of parents, students, and community-based organizations.
- d. Funds reserved under section 4112(a) will not duplicate the efforts of the state education agency and local educational agencies with regard to the provisions of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and that those funds will be used to serve populations not normally served by the state educational agencies and local educational agencies and populations that need special services, such as school dropouts, suspended and expelled students, youth in detention centers, runaway or homeless children and youth, and pregnant and parenting youth.
- e. The state will cooperate with, and assist, the Secretary in conducting data collection as required by section 4122.
- f. LEAs in the state will comply with the provisions of section 9501 pertaining to the participation of private school children and teachers in the programs and activities under this program.
- g. Funds under this program will be used to increase the level of state, local, and other non-federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this program, and in no case supplant such state, local, and other non-federal funds.

- h. A needs assessment was conducted by the state for drug and violence prevention programs, which shall be based on ongoing state evaluation activities, including data on the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence among youth in schools and communities, including the age of onset, the perception of health risks, and the perception of social disapproval among such youth, the prevalence of protective factors, buffers, or assets and other variables in the school and community identified through scientifically based research.
- i. The state will develop and implement procedures for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward meeting the performance measures.
- j. The state application will be available for public review after submission of the application.
- k. Special outreach activities will be carried out by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the state to maximize the participation of community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness that provide services such as mentoring programs in low-income communities.
- l. Funds will be used by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the state to support, develop, and implement community-wide comprehensive drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities.
- m. The state will develop a process for review of applications from local educational agencies that includes receiving input from parents.

10. Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers

Assure that the SEA will—

- a. Write the state application in consultation and coordination with appropriate state officials, including the chief state school officer, and other state agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the state health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
- b. Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
- c. Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.
- d. Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
- e. Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

11. Title V, Part A—Innovative Programs

Assure that—

- a. The state has set forth the allocation of funds required to implement section 5142 (participation of children enrolled in private schools).

- b. The state has made provision for timely public notice and public dissemination of the information concerning allocations of funds required to implement provisions for assistance to students attending private schools.
- c. Apart from providing technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the SEA has not exercised, and will not exercise, any influence in the decision making processes of LEAs as to the expenditure made pursuant to the LEAs' application for program funds submitted under section 5133.

Appendix A

Intent to Apply—Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program (Title VI, section 6112)—Program Information and Proposed Selection Criteria

Enhanced assessment instruments for limited English proficient (LEP) students

The WDPI proposes to develop and enhance assessment instruments specially designed to measure LEP students' performance and adequate yearly progress in: (1) English proficiency and literacy skills based on state standards on reading, writing, and language arts; and (2) alternate assessment through alternate performance indicators (APIs) employing Measuring Essential Communication in the Content Areas (MECCA) designed to measure LEP student performance in academic content areas based on vigorous state standards in math, science, social studies, and technology. A national advisory panel consisting of experts and representatives of research organizations in assessments will be created. The WDPI will collaborate with institutions of higher education (IHEs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and other state educational agencies (SEAs). A full application will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) on or before September 15, 2002.

This project embraces the USDE's application requirements and proposes to incorporate the following components:

- **Collaboration:** To ensure and improve the quality, validity, and reliability of state academic assessments beyond the requirements for the assessment described in section 1111(b)(3) of Title I, Part A, this project proposes to collaborate with IHEs; research institutions; or other organizations with experience, expertise, and knowledge base in the development, research and implementation of assessment instruments.
- **Multiple measures of student academic achievement:** This project proposes to develop, enhance, and field-test alternate assessment instruments, the alternate performance indicators using MECCA for measuring student achievement in academic content areas based on rigorous state standards as part of the state assessment system.
- **Chart of student progress over time:** This project proposes to develop technology-based systems to chart student progress in English proficiency and literacy skills development and academic achievement in language arts, math, science, and social studies.
- **Technology-based comprehensive academic assessments:** These assessments are designed to evaluate student academic achievement in English reading, language arts, math, science, and social studies.

In this project, we address the following competitive preferences:

- **Alternate assessment:** We propose to develop, enhance, and field-test standards-based APIs designed to measure academic achievement of English language learners (ELL) while they are in the early stages of English language acquisition, that is, levels 1-3, as measured by state-approved instruments. The APIs, designed for measuring essential communication in the content areas MECCA, will advance assessment practice significantly in the area of assessment of students with limited English proficiency. The proposed alternate performance indicators

using MECCA will include strategies for test design and development by classroom teachers and for test administration with or without accommodations, scoring, and reporting.

- **Collaboration:** The scope of this project requires extensive collaborative efforts among state educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, research organizations, and consulting firms and/or individuals.
- **Dissemination:** To advance the development of language and academic assessments of LEP students and share information on effective practices, success stories, barriers, problems, etc., this project proposes to disseminate results of project activities at the local, state, regional and national levels. The dissemination, followed by training activities, will help facilitate the implementation of assessment instruments developed by this project.

1. Need for the project

- 3.1. There is a lack of standards-based English proficiency assessment instruments. Currently, there are no assessment instruments designed for measuring English proficiency of ELL that are based on rigorous state standards and on communicative competency for English speaking and listening.
- 3.2. There is a lack of standards-based English literacy assessment instruments designed for measuring English literacy skills for ELL that are based on state standards on reading, writing, and language arts.
- 3.3. There is a need to enhance and validate the Wisconsin's framework on standards-based alternate assessment instruments designed for measuring ELLs' performance in math, science, and social studies while they are acquiring English as a second language.
- 3.4. There is a lack of technology-based learning activities and assessment instruments and techniques for classroom teachers to use for teaching and measuring: (1) English proficiency; (2) English literacy skills; and (3) academic concepts and performance in content areas.
- 3.5. There is a lack of sustainable professional development in assessment instruments and the test administration at local educational agency and institution of higher education levels.
- 3.6. There is a need to collaborate with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, other state educational agencies, and professional organizations with expertise and experience in the development and implementation of assessment instruments specially designed for ELL.
- 3.7. There is a need to disseminate the results of the development and administering of assessment instruments at the local, state, and national levels.
- 3.8. There is a need to conduct research on the validity and reliability of the following assessment instruments:
 - a. Assessment instruments for measuring English proficiency.
 - b. Assessment instruments for measuring English literacy skills.
 - c. Assessment instruments for measuring the standards-based alternate performance indicators employing API/MECCA.

2. Scope, Goals, and Objectives

We propose to develop standards-based assessment instruments for measuring ELLs' performance and progress in: (1) English proficiency; (2) English literacy skills; and (3) achievement in academic content areas using an alternate assessment approach. This project will present goals and objectives that are clearly specified, measurable, and achievable. Major goals in this project include:

Goal 1: To develop state standards-based assessment instruments for measuring English proficiency and literacy skills for LEP students.

- Objective 1.1: To develop, enhance, and field test assessment instruments for measuring English proficiency of English language learners based on grade- and age-appropriate state standards.
- Objective 1.2: To develop, enhance, and field test assessment instruments for measuring English literacy based on grade- and age-appropriate state standards on reading, writing, and language arts.
- Objective 1.3: To develop technology-based instruments and tabulating techniques for assessment of English proficiency.
- Objective 1.4: To develop technology-based instruments and tabulating techniques for assessment of English literacy skills.
- Objective 1.5: To align content-based ESL curriculum and materials with core curriculum standards in English reading, writing, and language arts.
- Objective 1.6: To provide training on how to administer English language assessment instruments to educational personnel at the district level.

Goal 2: To develop and enhance state standards-based alternate assessments with APIs for measuring academic performance of LEP students in math, science, and social studies.

- Objective 2.1: To develop, enhance, and field test alternate performance indicators for Measuring Essential Communication in Content Areas (MECCA) for LEP students in math, science, and social studies based on rigorous state standards expected of all students.
- Objective 2.2: To provide training to educational personnel on how to implement the API/MECCA instruments, collect and analyze academic performance data, and report results as part of the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS).

Goal 3: To improve and promote English language acquisition and academic achievement through technology, this project will develop, adopt, and enhance computer and technology skills with performance indicators related to English language acquisition, literacy skills development, academic content learning, and career path exploration for ELL. Technology-based assessment is an integral part of this goal.

- Objective 3.1: To adopt, adapt, or develop technology-based English language acquisition activities with computerized assessments.
- Objective 3.2: To adopt, adapt, or develop technology-based English literacy skill development activities with computerized assessments.

- Objective 3.4: To adopt, adapt, or develop computerized English proficiency learning activities and promote self-paced engagement in those learning activities with self-evaluation of student performance based on learning objectives and outcomes as measured by computerized assessments of English proficiency indicators designed for English language learners.
- Objective 3.5: To adopt, adapt, or develop computerized English literacy skills and learning activities, and promote self-paced engagement in those learning activities with self-evaluation of student performance based on learning objectives and outcomes as measured by computerized assessments.
- Objective 3.6: To adopt, adapt, or develop computerized academic content learning activities and promote self-paced engagement in those learning activities with self-evaluation of student performance based on learning objectives and outcomes as measured by computerized assessments.
- Objective 3.7: To adopt, adapt, and/or develop computerized ESL learning activities based on academic content areas, using a content-based ESL approach, with self-evaluation of student performance based on learning objectives and outcomes as measured by computerized assessments.

Goal 4: To provide training-of-trainers on assessment instruments designed for measuring English language proficiency, literacy skills, and standards-based alternate assessment (API/MECCA) for prospective trainers at LEA and IHE levels:

- Objective 4.1: To provide training on assessment instruments and how to administer them to educational personnel at the LEA level. All LEAs with LEP students, with or without Title III of NCLB subgrants, will be invited to attend the training sessions.
- Objective 4.2: To provide training on assessment instruments and how to administer them to faculty members and graduate students at the IHE level. All approved ESL/bilingual education programs at the IHE level will be invited to participate in the training sessions.
- Objective 4.3: To provide training on technology skills for all assessment instruments.

Goal 5: To collaborate with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, and other research institutions in the development, research, and administration of assessment instruments. The WDPI will collaborate with the following agencies:

- UW System Institutions: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, and Cardinal Stritch University.
- Local educational agencies: Appleton Area School District, Milwaukee Public Schools, Madison Metropolitan School District, Wausau School District, Sheboygan School District, Green Bay School District, Manitowoc School District, Stevens Points School District, and other school districts with significant numbers of LEP students..
- Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs).
- Research institutions: Center for Applied Linguistics, Educational Testing Service, Illinois Resource Center, and others.

- Prospective SEA partners: Illinois Department of Education (Illinois Resource Center), Iowa Department of Education, Minnesota Department of Children and Families (state Educational Agency), and Indiana Department of Education.

Goal 6: To disseminate information on the development and administering of assessment instruments at state and national levels.

- State conferences.
- National conferences.
- Publications (website, professional journals, etc.).

Goal 7: To conduct research on the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments.

- Objective 7.1: To conduct research on the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments designed to measure English proficiency of English language learners.
- Objective 7.2: To conduct research on the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments designed to measure English literacy skills of English language learners.
- Objective 7.3: To conduct research on the validity and reliability of the standards-based alternate assessment instruments employing API/MECCA designed to measure English proficiency of English language learners.
- Objective 7.4: To conduct research on:

7.4(a) effectiveness of computerized content-based ESL learning activities for English language learners.

7.4(b) effectiveness of computerized academic content learning activities for English language learners.

7.4(c) validity and reliability of computerized assessment instruments designed to measure: (1) English proficiency of English language learners; and English literacy skills of English language learners.

7.4(d) validity and reliability of API/MECCA for measuring academic achievement of English language learners.

A full application will be developed and adequately address the following section criteria:

3. Significance

- 3.1. The potential contribution of this project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems. The implementation and research related to the development of assessment instruments in this project will definitely increase the knowledge and understanding of standards-based educational problems facing educators and LEP students. Classroom-based instructional activities will help shape and guide the development of assessment instruments for measuring English language acquisition and cognitive academic language development. The results from this project will replace commercial language assessment instruments that are not based on state standards in speaking, reading, writing, and language arts.

- 3.2. The potential contribution of this project to develop and advance of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study. With assistance and cooperation from experts and practitioners from across the country in the development and test administration, we firmly believe that the results from this project will advance the knowledge and practices in the assessment of LEP students in two areas: English language acquisition and academic achievement in content areas. The results from this project will further the understanding of theory of language acquisition and cognitive academic development for LEP students.
- 3.3. The likelihood that this project will yield findings that may be used by other appropriate agencies and organizations. We strongly believe that after development and field-testing, the proposed assessment instruments can be used for assessing language and academic achievement and progress of LEP students by local educational agencies. Furthermore, institutions of higher education can use the instruments for preservice and inservice training purposes.
- 3.4. This project will involve the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. This project proposes to develop state standards-based assessment instruments for measuring:
- English language proficiency.
 - English literacy skills.
 - Academic achievement in content areas using alternate performance indicators.

These are new approaches or strategies designed for measuring language and academic performance of LEP students. We propose to further develop the alternate performance indicators as part of the state assessment system based on the framework we have developed in the last few years.

4. Quality of Project Design

- 4.1. Conceptual framework underlying the proposed research, development, and demonstration activities; and the quality of the following:
- 4.1(a) Conceptual framework.
 - 4.1(b) Quality of framework.
- 4.2. The quality of the proposed design and procedures for documenting project activities and results.
- 4.3. The design for implementing and evaluating this project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed.
- 4.4. This project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of federal financial assistance.
- 4.5. This project is designed to reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- 4.6. This project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.
- 4.7. This project employs a high quality methodology.

5. Quality of Management Plan

- 5.1 This project provides an adequate management plan to achieve the objectives on time and within the budget with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- 5.2 The time commitments of the project director, principal investigator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the project.

6. Quality of Project Personnel

- 6.1 This project encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.
- 6.2 This project will specify the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.
- 6.3 The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel
- 6.4 The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.
 - 6.3(a) Consultants
 - 6.3(b) Subcontractors

7. Adequacy of Resources

The following factors will be considered:

- 7.1 The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the SEA or the lead applicant SEA.
 - 7.1(a) Resources from Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction as the lead applicant.
 - 7.2(b) Resources from partners, consultants, and subcontractors.
- 7.2 The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the implementation and success of this project.
- 7.3 The budget is adequate to support the project.

8. Quality of Evaluation Plan

Introduction

- Formative evaluation.
- Summative evaluation.

- 8.1 The methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes.

Goals and objectives	Methods of evaluation	Indicators of success, measures for outcomes	Timelines

8.2 The methods are appropriate in the context within which the project operates.

8.3 The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes that will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

8.4 The evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other situations.

Appendix B

Needs Assessment Measure used by the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program

The following describe the needs assessment measure used by the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services for the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program.

Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). This survey is administered every 2 years through the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Reports have been submitted for the years, 1993, 1997, 1999, and 2001. The purpose of this study is to take a “snapshot” of the health and well being of Wisconsin adolescents. By understanding the barriers to learning, as well as the factors that can strengthen children, we can develop strategies that will ensure their academic, vocational, social, and emotional success. This, in turn, can ensure a brighter future for all of us.

In addition to using data gathered and reported in the 2001 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, the Division of Children and Family Services also implemented a new data collection instrument titled “County Youth Risk Indicator Report”. This report was developed in response to the implementation of the Brighter Future budget initiative which funds adolescent prevention programs in five areas: youth violence, AODA, child abuse and neglect, nonmarital pregnancy and self-sufficiency.

The Department of Health and Family Services, through a contract with the University of Wisconsin Center for Health Policy and Program Evaluation (CHPPE), has compiled a benchmark indicator report including the development of a county by county composite indicator score used to evaluate a county’s status of need based on the legislative indicators identified within the Brighter Futures initiative. This composite indicator is known as “Youth Risk” and is made up of six indicators relating to the benchmark areas. The indicators are: Juvenile Part I arrests per 10,000 juveniles (youth violence); youth substance abuse arrests per 10,000 juveniles (AODA), substantiated cases of maltreatment per 10,000 juveniles (child abuse and neglect), births to unmarried women aged 17 and under per 10,000 births (nonmarital pregnancy) ACT scores and high school dropouts per 10,000 students (self-sufficiency).

Factor analysis was used to combine these six indicators into a single composite indicator of Youth Risk.

The Governor's Budget for the 1999-2001 biennium creates \$46.90, titled 'Brighter Futures Initiative.' Under Brighter Futures, the Department of Health and Family Services, Bureau of Children and Family Services, funds prevention services and programs related to adolescents. Specifically, these programs may have the following purposes:

- Prevent and reduce the incidence of youth violence and other delinquent behavior.
- Prevent and reduce the incidence of youth alcohol and other drug use and abuse.
- Prevent and reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect.
- Prevent and reduce the incidence of nonmarital pregnancy and increase the use of abstinence as a method of preventing non-marital pregnancy.
- Increase adolescent self-sufficiency by encouraging high school graduation, preparedness, improved social and other interpersonal skills and other responsible decision making.

The composite indicator of Youth Risk was constructed by combining several individual indicators using a statistical technique known as factor analysis, which transforms the individual indicators and sums them. The details of factor analysis can be found in any advanced statistics textbook. One or more indicators were selected for each component of Youth Risk described in §46.90. The criteria for selecting these indicators are as follows:

1. Each indicator must be obviously related to the component of Youth Risk being measured. Statisticians call this "face validity." Basically, there has to be a good argument made for including each indicator.
2. The indicators must be collected and published at the county level. The reason is obvious, since the project's goal is to calculate a measure of county risk. Fortunately, most data compiled by state agencies meets this criterion.
3. The data must be published annually. This criterion allows for subsequent annual updates of the analysis, in order to measure changes from the baseline condition.

Indicators meeting these criteria will be factor analyzed, resulting in a single score for each county that measured overall youth risk.

The advantages of this composite indicator strategy are as follows:

1. It makes use of all the relevant data from each county. Selecting a single indicator--for example, some measure of per capita youth crime--looks at only part of a complicated phenomenon. Further, using any single indicator is arbitrary and may lead the analyst to make an error in classifying counties. This is because each single indicator has limitations caused by measurement. By including several indicators in the model, these measurement problems tend to cancel out, leaving a more accurate measure of Youth Risk.
2. This strategy uses existing data and avoids the expense and time involved in collecting new information.
3. The strategy provides a single overall score for each county
4. The data can be easily updated annually.

OVERVIEW OF THE INDICATORS

Non-marital Pregnancy.

For this report, births to teen-aged unwed mothers will be treated as the number of births to unwed mothers aged 17 years or less. The number of live births to teen-aged mothers will be reported as a rate per 10,000 live births in the county

Self-sufficiency. Two indicators suggested themselves strongly to measure self-sufficiency. The first is high school dropouts, which will be computed as the number of dropouts per 10,000 high school student. Data are reported for each school year.

The second variable is mean ACT scores, which are a measure of preparedness for college. Data are reported for the 1995-1996 and 1996-1997 school years.

Youth Violence. This risk concept refers to the participation of youth in violent and other delinquent behavior.

The Office of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice publishes a comprehensive report each year of reported crimes and juvenile arrests under the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. Part I arrests are more serious and include murder; negligent manslaughter; forcible rape; robbery; aggravated assault; burglary; theft; motor vehicle theft; and arson.

The prevention focus of Brighter Futures is primarily on violent youth activity and therefore the indicator of choice should be juvenile arrests for Part I offenses, which are the most serious behaviors. This report will not break down arrests by offense; instead, the total number of Part I arrests will be used as the indicator for this risk concept. This is done for two reasons. First, all of the offenses listed under Part I are serious, even though several (burglary or theft) are not specifically crimes against persons. Second, some of the more violent offenses are actually relatively rare among juveniles and using only a sum of arrests for murder, rape and assault would not show enough variation among counties in violent crime rates. Statistically, it is desirable to have high variation among counties on the measure used in the factor analysis. Simply using murder arrests would not allow the method to distinguish between counties, since most counties report no juvenile arrests for murder.

The indicator used here will be juvenile Part I arrests, per 10,000 juveniles.

The indicator has one major limitation, in that it measures actual arrests, not youth criminal activity. Not all crimes are reported, and not all reported crimes are cleared by arrests. Crime and Arrests does provide information on reported crimes, but there is, of course, no way of knowing whether a reported crime was committed by a juvenile or an adult without a clearance. This indicator is not truly a measure of serious youth delinquent activity but rather of delinquent activity that is reported and cleared by arrest.

Alcohol and Other Drug Use (AODA). Barring a large and detailed survey, which would allow for county level estimates of youth AODA, this study will have to rely on some measure of AODA that is reported by local law enforcement agencies. The Department of Justice' *Crime and Arrests* annual report provides county and jurisdiction breakdowns for juvenile liquor violations, juvenile drug arrests, and juvenile OWI. These three indicators can be combined to yield a count of the total number of juvenile arrests that have an AODA component.

Abuse and Neglect. Child maltreatment data is provided by the Division of Children and Family Services in an annual report. The indicator used here will be the rate of substantiated cases of maltreatment per 10,000 juveniles.

This indicator has the same inherent reporting bias as the criminal activity and AODA indicators, in that not all cases of maltreatment will be reported. However, reporting of these cases has improved in recent years. A further problem is that data are only available for calendar year 1996; the Division has not yet released 1997 data.

The data collected have some limitations that should be mentioned:

The non-marital pregnancy indicator does not really measure the number of pregnancies to youth. Rather, it is a measure of the number of live births to unwed teenaged mothers. The Bureau of Health Information does not report the age or marital status of the mother except in the case of live births.

Self-sufficiency is measured only by graduation rates and ACT scores. No attempt is made to measure this risk category using "nonscholastic" indicators, because no such data are collected and published by

the state. Self-sufficiency is measured here as the academic attainment of a county's high school-aged population.

The indicator of youth violence is arrests. As such it measures only crimes committed by juveniles that are cleared by an arrest. Crimes committed by juveniles that are never cleared would not be included in this indicator. Therefore, this indicator does not measure youth criminal activity, but only youth criminal arrests.

The AODA indicator is substance abuse arrests. This is, of course, a law enforcement indicator that measures AODA among youth only indirectly. In particular, this indicator may be influenced by local law enforcement policies and activities. It is to be assumed that most youth AODA does not result in an arrest. The only data published annually at the county level, though, is collected by law enforcement agencies and it would be impossible to measure AODA at the local level without using a large and expensive survey.

Finally, the abuse and neglect indicator counts only documented cases reported to the authorities. It undercounts, by an unknown extent, the true number of abuse and neglect cases.

The factor analysis used here showed that the six risk indicators all loaded highly a single factor; factor loading ranged from .528 to .734. The indicators most closely related to the factor were high school dropouts per 10,000 students, and births to women aged 17 and under, per 10,000 births.

The factor analysis computed factor scores for each county. These factor scores are the composite measure of Youth Risk and provide a single measure of each county's risk. The composite measures, along with the county's values on each of the six indicators, are found in an attached table. The Youth Risk indicator has no upper or lower limit; in the table, the Youth Risk score ranges from a high of 4.97 to a low of -1.70.

The ten counties ranking highest on the Youth Risk indicator are Menominee, Milwaukee, Racine, Rock, Forest, Kenosha, Douglas, Walworth, Iron, and Winnebago. The ten counties ranking lowest are: Ozaukee, Richland, Pepin, Lafayette, Price, Taylor, Calumet, Grant, Iowa and Waukesha. With a few exceptions, the counties ranking high on youth risk are urban counties, while those ranking lowest are rural counties.

Part I arrests per 10,000 juveniles (youth violence); youth substance abuse arrests per 10,000 juveniles (AODA), substantiated cases of maltreatment per 10,000 juveniles (child abuse and neglect), births to unmarried women aged 17 and under per 10,000 births (non-marital pregnancy) ACT scores and high school dropouts per 10,000 students (self-sufficiency).

Factor analysis was used to combine these six indicators into a single composite indicator of Youth Risk. The ten counties ranking highest on the Youth Risk indicator are Menominee, Milwaukee, Racine, Rock, Forest, Kenosha, Douglas, Walworth, Iron, Winnebago and Sheboygan. The ten counties ranking lowest are: Ozaukee, Richland, Pepin, Lafayette, Price, Taylor, Calumet Grant, Iowa and Waukesha. With a few exceptions, the counties ranking high on youth risk are urban counties, while those ranking lowest are rural counties.

Appendix C

Required 15 Program Elements of Even Start Family Literacy Programs

1. *Identification and Recruitment of Families Most In Need of Even Start Services.* Each project must identify and recruit families most in need of Even Start services, as indicated by a low level of income, a low level of adult literacy or English language proficiency of the eligible parent or parents, and other need-related indicators. It is important to note the distinction between families that are considered “eligible” for Even Start services and those actually served by a project. Even Start projects serve a small subset of the “eligible” population and must target families who are most in need of services.
2. *Screening and Preparation of Participants.* Each project must screen and prepare parents (including teenage parents) and children to enable such parents and children to participate fully in Even Start activities and services. This includes testing of parents to ensure eligibility for services, referral to necessary counseling, other developmental and support services, and related services. A project should ensure that each member of an eligible family is fully ready to benefit from the Even Start program prior to considering them for program participation.
3. *Flexible Scheduling and Support Services.* Each project must be designed to accommodate participants’ work schedules and other responsibilities, including the provision of support services when such services are unavailable from other sources. Flexibility in scheduling classes in order to optimize family participation and retention is especially critical given the demands of welfare reform, as are providing support services such as transportation, child care, and meals. [Services must be provided in each project to accommodate a three year age range for children.](#)
4. *High-Quality, Intensive Instructional Programs.* Each project must provide high-quality, intensive instructional programs that promote adult literacy and empower parents to support the educational growth of their children, developmentally appropriate early childhood services, and preparation of children for success in regular school programs. Each of the four core components is considered an instructional program. [Services must be provided in each project to accommodate a three year age range for children.](#)
5. *Staff Qualifications.* Each project must meet the following staff qualification requirements for staff whose salaries are paid in whole or in part with Even Start funds. Staff who are not paid with Even Start funds, such as staff supported by collaborators or partners, are not subject to the requirements of this program element.

Staff providing academic instruction

Instructional staff are considered those staff members who provide instruction in the four core Even Start components.

All instructional staff – by December 21, 2004, a majority of the individuals providing academic instruction:

1. Must have obtained an associate's, bachelor's, or graduate degree in a field related to (See Q10.) early childhood education, elementary or secondary school education, or adult education; and
2. If applicable, must meet qualifications established by the state for early childhood education, elementary or secondary school education, or adult education provided as part of an Even Start program or another family literacy program.

New instructional staff who are hired to work in Even Start projects must, when they are hired:

1. have obtained an associate's, bachelor's, or graduate degree in a field related to early childhood education, elementary or secondary school education, or adult education; and
2. If applicable, meet qualifications established by the state for early childhood education, elementary or secondary school education, or adult education provided as part of an Even Start program or another family literacy program.

Project Director

Not later than December 21, 2004, the individual responsible for administration of family literacy services must have received training in the operation of a family literacy program.

Paraprofessionals

Not later than December 21, 2004, paraprofessionals who provide support for academic instruction must have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

6. *Staff Training.* Each project must train staff, including child care staff, to develop the skills necessary to work with parents and young children in the full range of Even Start instructional services offered.
7. *Home-Based Instructional Services.* Each project must provide and monitor integrated instructional services to participating parents and children through home-based services. The Secretary recommends that a project provide home-based services for every Even Start family on a regular basis. These services should be designed to improve the literacy skills of children or their parents, or both, and communicate the message that the home is a child's first classroom just as the parent is a child's first teacher.
8. *Year-Round Services.* Each project must operate on a year-round basis, including the provision of some program services, instructional and enrichment, during the summer months. This allows families to receive continuous opportunities to improve their learning and avoid the common drop-off in achievement that often occurs during long breaks or vacations. Therefore, the families served during the summer should be the same families served during the school year.
9. *Coordination with Other Programs.* Each project must coordinate with relevant programs such as Title I, Part A, Early Reading First, Reading First, Migrant Education, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Head Start, and volunteer literacy programs. Local projects must also coordinate with any relevant programs under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and Title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and any other relevant programs.

10. ***Instructional Programs Based on Scientifically-based Reading Research.*** Each project must use instructional programs based on scientifically-based reading research (as defined in section 1208) for children and adults, to the extent such research is available. The underlying premise of basing instructional programs on scientifically-based reading research is that using strategies and techniques that are demonstrated to be effective through the application of scientific research methods will give states, districts, and schools a higher probability that children enter school prepared to learn to read and adults significantly improve their literacy and help their children succeed in school.
11. ***Attendance and Retention.*** Each project must encourage participating families to attend regularly and to remain in the program a sufficient time to meet their program goals. Each individual program determines what is reasonable attendance for a family in order to achieve its educational goals and to remain as an active participant in the program. **Services must be provided in each project to accommodate a three year age range for children.**
12. ***Reading Readiness Activities Based on Scientifically-based Reading Research.*** Each project must base its reading readiness activities for preschool children on scientifically-based reading research (as defined in section 1208 of the ESEA), to the extent available, to ensure children enter elementary school ready to learn to read.
13. ***Continuity of Services.*** Each project must promote the continuity of family literacy, to the extent applicable, to ensure that individuals retain and improve their educational outcomes. Educational services supplementing in-school instruction provided through the early school years can be critical to sustaining gains made during the preschool years.
14. ***Providing Services to Families Most In Need.*** Each project must ensure that the program will serve those families most in need of Even Start activities and services. This is related to Program Element #1.
15. ***Local Independent Evaluation.*** Each project must provide for an independent evaluation of the program that it will use for program improvement. The independent evaluation generally is conducted annually and provides critical data and information to the local program on the performance of families as well as on the quality of the implementation of the core components and program elements. The project must use this data and information and make connections to the state Indicators of Program Quality for participant progress monitoring and continuous program improvement to lead to better participant outcomes.

*These elements are embedded in the Continuous Progress Assessment (CPA) Guide and Monitoring Document which can be accessed on the following website:

<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlse/title1/es1.html>

Appendix D

Acronyms

AODA	alcohol and other drug abuse
AYP	adequate yearly progress
CBO	community based organization
CCSSO	Council of Chief State Schools Organization
CC-VI	Comprehensive (Regional Assistance) Center-Region VI
CESA	Cooperative Educational Service Agency
CITSC	CESA Instructional Technology Services Council
CLC	Community Learning Center
CPA	continuous progress assessment
CSR	comprehensive school reform
CSS	Characteristics of Successful Schools
ECB	Educational Communications Board
ELL	English Language Learners
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESFL	Even Start Family Literacy
ESL	English as a second language
FACETS	(Wisconsin) Family Assistance Center for Education
GED	general education diploma
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IHE	institute of higher education
LEA	local education agency
LEP	limited English proficient
MECCA	measuring essential communication in the content areas
MEP	migrant education program
MPS	Milwaukee Public Schools
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
NCREL	North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
NWP	New Wisconsin Promise
PIRC	Parent Information Resource Center
RFP	request for proposal

SAGE	Student Achievement Guarantee in Education
SAHE	State Agency for Higher Education
SEA	state education agency
SIG	State Incentive Grant
SWP	schoolwide programs
TAAS	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills
TANF	temporary assistance for needy families
TEACH WI	Technology for Educational Achievement in Wisconsin
TLCF	Technology Literacy Challenge Fund
USDE	United States Department of Education
UW	University of Wisconsin
UWS	University of Wisconsin System
WADE	Wisconsin Association of Distance Education Networks
WAICU	Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
WDHFS	Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services
WDOJ	Wisconsin Department of Justice
WDPI	Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
WDOT	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
WEMA	Wisconsin Educational Media Association
WIABE	Wisconsin Association for Bilingual Education
WINSS	Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools
WITESOL	Wisconsin Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages
WKCE	Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Evaluations
WSAS	Wisconsin Student Assessment System
WUCMAA	Wisconsin United Coalition of Mutual Assistance Association